arXiv:1602.00409v1 [math.GR] 1 Feb 2016

SUPER-APPROXIMATION, II: THE p-ADIC AND BOUNDED POWER OF SQUARE-FREE INTEGERS CASES.

ALIREZA SALEHI GOLSEFIDY

Abstract. Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$, and $\Gamma := \langle\Omega\rangle$. Then the family of Cayley graphs $\{\mathrm{Cay}(\pi_m(\Gamma), \pi_m(\Omega))\}_m$ is a family of expanders as m ranges over fixed powers of square-free integers and powers of primes that are coprime to q_0 if and only if the connected component of the Zariski-closure of Γ is perfect. Some of the immediate applications, e.g. orbit equivalence rigidity, *largeness* of certain ℓ-adic Galois representations, are also discussed.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Statement of the main results. 2
1.2. Comparing with the previous related results. 2
1.3. Applications 3
Acknowledgments. 6
2. Preliminary results. 6
2.1. Necessity. 6
2.2. A few reductions. 7
2.3. Algebraic homomorphisms and the congruence maps. 7
2.4. Ping-pong players. 9
2.5. Summary of the initial reductions. 10
3. Expansion, approximate subgroup, and bounded generation. 10
3.1. Largeness of level-Q approximate subgroups implies super-approximation. 10
3.2. Reduction to bounded generation and abelian unipotent radical. 10
4. Super-approximation: bounded power of square-free integers case. 13
4.1. The residue maps do not split. 13
4.2. Statistical non-splitting of residue maps. 15
4.3. Bounded generation of perfect groups by commutators. 16
4.4. Proof of Theorem 17 for bounded powers of square-free integers. 18
5. Super-approximation: the p-adic case. 20

Date: 09/09/2014.
1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E40.
A. S-G. was partially supported by the NSF grants DMS-1160472, DMS-1303121, and A. P. Sloan Research Fellowship.

5.1. Escape from proper subgroups. 20
5.2. Getting a large ideal by adding/subtracting a congruence subgroup boundedly many times. 25
5.3. Getting a p-adically large vector in a submodule in boundedly many steps. 26
5.4. Proof of super-approximation: the p-adic case. 27
6. Appendix A: quantitative open image for p-adic analytic maps. 28
References 35

1. Introduction

1.1. **Statement of the main results.** Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q})$, and $\Gamma = \langle \Omega \rangle$. Since Ω is finite, for some $q_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ we have $\Gamma \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$. *Strong approximation* implies that (under certain algebraic conditions) the closure of Γ in $\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is open in $\prod_{p\nmid q_0}(\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p))$, where $\mathbb{G}$ is the Zariski-closure of Γ in $\mathbb{GL}_n$. In combinatorial language, this means that the Schreier graph

$$\mathrm{Sch}\left(\pi_m(\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q})\cap \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])), \pi_m(\Omega)\right),$$

where m and q_0 are coprime, have at most $C := C(\Omega)$ many connected components. The point being that C does not depend on m. *Super-approximation*[1] tells us that these sparse graphs are *highly connected*, i.e. they form a family of *expanders*. Such graphs are extremely useful in communication and theoretical computer science (e.g. see [HLW06]). In the past decade they have been found useful in a wide range of pure math problems, e.g. affine sieve [BGS10, SGS13], sieve in groups [LM13], variation of Galois representations [EHK12], etc. (see [BO14] for a collection of surveys of related works and applications).

In this article we prove the *best possible* super-approximation results for two families of residue maps. Let $V_f(\mathbb{Q})$ be the set of primes in $\mathbb{Q}$, and $\nu_p(q)$ be the p-valuation of q, i.e. the power of p in q.

Theorem 1. *Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of $\mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$, $\Gamma := \langle\Omega\rangle$, and M_0 be a fixed positive integer. Then the family of Cayley graphs $\{\mathrm{Cay}(\pi_m(\Gamma), \pi_m(\Omega))\}_m$ is a family of expanders as m runs through either*

$$\{p^n |\ n\in\mathbb{Z}^+, p\in V_f(\mathbb{Q}), p\nmid q_0\} \ \text{ or } \ \{q|\ \forall p\in V_f(\mathbb{Q}), \nu_p(q)\leq M_0\}$$

if and only if the connected component $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ of the Zariski-closure $\mathbb{G}$ of Γ in $\mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$ is perfect, i.e. $[\mathbb{G}^\circ,\mathbb{G}^\circ]=\mathbb{G}^\circ$.

1.2. **Comparing with the previous related results.** The importance of Theorem 1 lies on the fact that it is an *if-and-only-if* statement. In fact, by Proposition 8, we get that, if $\{\pi_{m_i}(\Gamma), \pi_{m_i}(\Omega)\}$ is a family of expanders for some increasing sequence $\{m_i\}$ of integers that are relatively prime to q_0, then $\{\pi_m(\Gamma),\pi_m(\Omega)\}_m$ is a family of expanders as m runs through integers specified in Theorem 1.

Super-approximation for square-free numbers is the main theorem of [SGV12]. Of course it is a special case of Theorem 1 for $m\in\{q|\ \forall p\in V_f(\mathbb{Q}), \nu_p(q)\leq M_0\}$ and $M_0=1$. It should, however, be noted that our proof relies on [SGV12]. Proof of this part of Theorem 1 is heavily influenced by the relevant part of [BV12].

Proof of Theorem 1 for powers of primes relies on [SG-b] where the semisimple case is proved.

Prior to [SG-b], the case of *Zariski-dense* subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ was studied by Bourgain-Gamburd [BG08-b, BG09] and Bourgain-Varjú [BV12]. For the comparison of these proofs we refer the interested reader to [SG-b, Section 1.3].

It is worth pointing out that, if Γ is a Zariski-dense subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$, Bourgain and Varjú [BV12] prove that $\{\mathrm{Cay}(\pi_m(\Gamma),\pi_m(\Omega))\}_m$ is a family of expanders with *no restriction* on m.

[1] Following A. Kontorovich's suggestion, I call this phenomenon super-approximation. It is worth pointing out that this phenomenon has been called superstrong approximation [BO14] by some authors.

1.3. **Applications.**

1.3.1. *Random-walk and spectral gap.* Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of a compact group G. Let μ be the counting probability measure on Ω and $\Gamma := \langle\Omega\rangle$. Let

$$T_\mu : L^2(\overline{\Gamma}) \to L^2(\overline{\Gamma}),\ \ T_\mu(f) := \mu * f,$$

where $(\mu * f)(g) := \sum_{g' \in \operatorname{supp}\mu} \mu(g') f(g'^{-1}g)$ and $\overline{\Gamma}$ is the closure of Γ in G. It is easy to see that T_μ is a self-adjoint operator, the constant function $\mathbb{1}_{\overline{\Gamma}}$ is an eigenfunction with eigenvalue one, i.e. $T_\mu(\mathbb{1}_{\overline{\Gamma}}) = \mathbb{1}_{\overline{\Gamma}}$, and $\|T_\mu\| = 1$. Let

$$\lambda(\mu; G) := \sup\{|\lambda|\|\ \ \lambda \in \operatorname{spec}(T_\mu),\ \lambda < 1\}.$$

We get a fairly good understanding of the random-walk in G with respect to μ if $\lambda(\mu; G) < 1$, in which case it is said that either $\Gamma \curvearrowright \overline{\Gamma}$ or the random-walk with respect to μ has *spectral gap*. It is well-known that Theorem 1 implies the following.

Corollary 2. *Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of $\mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$, and $\mathcal{P}_\Omega$ be the counting probability measure on Ω. Suppose the connected component $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ of the Zariski-closure $\mathbb{G}$ of $\Gamma := \langle\Omega\rangle$ in $\mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$ is perfect. Then for any positive integer M_0 we have*

$$\lambda(\mathcal{P}_\Omega; \prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}/p^{M_0}\mathbb{Z})) < 1,$$

and

$$\sup_{p\nmid q_0} \lambda(\mathcal{P}_\Omega; \mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)) < 1.$$

Since a stronger form of the *only-if* part of Theorem 1 (see Proposition 8) holds, having spectral for a single prime implies a uniform spectral gap for all the primes.

Corollary 3. *Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of $\mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$, and $\mathcal{P}_\Omega$ be the counting probability measure on Ω. Then for some $p \nmid q_0$ we have $\lambda(\mathcal{P}_\Omega; \mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)) < 1$ if and only if*

$$\sup_{p\nmid q_0} \lambda(\mathcal{P}_\Omega; \mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)) < 1.$$

Spectral gap has a well-known *weighted equidistribution* consequence.

Corollary 4. *In the setting of Corollary 2, there is $\lambda < 1$ such that for any prime p that does not divide q_0 and $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$-finite function f on $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ we have*

$$|\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \mathcal{P}_\Omega^{(l)}(\gamma) f(\gamma) - \int_{\Gamma_p} f(g)dg| \le \|f - \int_{\Gamma_p} f(g)dg\|_2 \sqrt{|f\cdot\Gamma_p|}\lambda^l,$$

where Γ_p acts from right on functions on $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, i.e. $(f\cdot g)(g') := f(gg')$, $\mathcal{P}_\Omega^{(l)}$ is the l-th convolution power of $\mathcal{P}_\Omega$, dg is the probability Haar measure on Γ_p, and $\|f\|_2 := (\int_{g\in\Gamma_p} f(g)^2 dg)^{1/2}$.

Proof. Since Ω is a symmetric set, we have that

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \mathcal{P}_\Omega^{(l)}(\gamma) f(\gamma) - \int_{\Gamma_p} f(g)dg = T_\mu^l(f)(e) - \langle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p}, f\rangle, \tag{1}$$

where $\langle , \rangle$ is the dot product in $L^2(\Gamma_p)$.

On the other hand, by Corollary 2, we have that

$$\|T_\mu^l(f) - \langle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p}, f\rangle\|_2 = \|T_\mu^l(f - \langle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p}, f\rangle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p})\|_2 \le \lambda^l \|f - \langle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p}, f\rangle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p})\|_2. \tag{2}$$

Let $P := \{g \in \Gamma_p |\ f \cdot g = f\}$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|T^l_\mu(f) - \langle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p}, f\rangle\|_2^2 &= \int_{P\backslash\Gamma_p}\int_P |T^l_\mu(f)(gg') - \langle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p}, f\rangle|^2 dg'dg \\ &= \int_{P\backslash\Gamma_p} |T^l_\mu(f)(g) - \langle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p}, f\rangle|^2 \int_P dg'dg \\ &= \frac{1}{[\Gamma_p : P]} \sum_{gP\in\Gamma_p/P} |T^l_\mu(f)(g) - \langle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p}, f\rangle|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{|T^l_\mu(f)(e) - \langle \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_p}, f\rangle|^2}{|f\cdot\Gamma_p|}. \qquad (3)\end{aligned}$$

Equations (1), (2), and (3) imply the claim. □

Corollary 4 is another indication that *super-approximation* is a suitable name for such a phenomenon as it implies a quantitative way to approximate points.

1.3.2. *Orbit equivalence.* Suppose $\Gamma \subseteq G$ and $\Lambda \subseteq H$ are dense subgroups of compact groups G and H. We say the left translation actions $\Gamma \curvearrowright (G, m_G)$ and $\Lambda \curvearrowright (H, m_H)$ are *orbit equivalence* if there exists a measure class preserving Borel isomorphism $\theta : G \to H$ such that $\theta(\Gamma g) = \Lambda\theta(g)$, for m_G-almost every $g \in G$. Surprisingly, if Γ and Λ are amenable, the mentioned actions are orbit equivalence [OW80, CFW81]. In the past decade there have been a lot of progress on this subject, and as a result now it is known that one gets orbit equivalence rigidity under spectral gap assumption [Ioa14-a, Ioa14-b].

Corollary 5. *Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of $\mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$, and $\mathcal{P}_\Omega$ be the counting probability measure on Ω. Suppose the connected component $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ of the Zariski-closure $\mathbb{G}$ of $\Gamma := \langle\Omega\rangle$ in $\mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$ is perfect. Let Γ_p be the closure of Γ in $\mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ where $p \nmid q_0$.*

Let Λ be a countable dense subgroup of a profinite group H. Then $\Gamma \curvearrowright (\Gamma_p, m_{\Gamma_p})$ and $\Lambda \curvearrowright (H, m_H)$ are orbit equivalent if and only if there are open subgroups $G_0 \subseteq \Gamma_p$ and $H_0 \subseteq H$ and a continuous isomorphism $\delta : G_0 \to H_0$ such that $[\Gamma_p : G_0] = [H : H_0]$ and $\delta(G_0 \cap \Gamma) = \Lambda \cap H_0$. In particular, H is p-adic analytic.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Corollary 2 and [Ioa14-a, Theorem A]. □

1.3.3. *Variations of Galois representations in one-parameter families of abelian varieties.* Since eight years ago, because of a surge of works by various people specially Cadoret, Tamagawa [Cad, CT12, CT13], Hui, and Larsen [Hui12, HL], we have got a much better understanding of the image of ℓ-adic and adelic Galois representations induced by Tate modules of an abelian scheme. On the other hand, Ellenberg, Hall, and Kowalski in [EHK12] gave a beautiful connection between variations of Galois representations and certain spectral gap property[2]. Here we make an observation that Ellenberg-Hall-Kowalski [EHK12] machinary combined with Theorem 1 gives an alternative approach towards [CT12, CT13]; in particular, we do not get any new result on this topic.

In this section, let k be a finitely generated characteristic zero field, and U be a smooth algebraic curve over k such that $U \times_k \overline{k}$ is connected. Let $\mathcal{A} \to U$ be an abelian scheme of dimension $g \geq 1$, defined over k. Let

$$\rho_0 : \pi_1(U(\mathbb{C}), y_0) \to \mathrm{Aut}_U(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq GL_{2g}(\mathbb{Z})$$

be the monodromy representation. Let $\Gamma := \rho_0(\pi_1(U(\mathbb{C}), y_0))$, and $\mathbb{G}$ be the Zariski-closure of Γ in $(\mathbb{GL}_{2g})_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Let Ω be a finite symmetric generating set of Γ.

[2]Instead of being *expanders*, they only need a weaker assumption on the relevant Schreier graphs, called *esperantist graphs*.

For any $x \in U(\overline{k})$, the fiber $\mathcal{A}_x$ over x is an abelian variety defined over the residue field $k(x)$ at x. For any prime l, let $T_{l,x}$ be the Tate module of $\mathcal{A}_x$, i.e.

$$T_{l,x} := \varprojlim \mathcal{A}_x[l^m](\overline{k}),$$

where $\mathcal{A}_x[l^m](\overline{k})$ is the l^m-th torsion elements of $\mathcal{A}_x(\overline{k})$. So $T_{l,x} \simeq \mathbb{Z}_l^{2g}$ and we get the l-adic Galois representation

$$\rho_{l,x} : \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{k}/k(x)) \to \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(T_{l,x}) \simeq \mathrm{GL}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}_l).$$

Lemma 6. *In the above setting, the connected component $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ of $\mathbb{G}$ is perfect.*

Proof. By [EHK12, Proposition 16], Γ has a finite index subgroup Λ such that $\pi_l(\Lambda)$ is a perfect group and generated by its order l elements for large enough prime l. In particular, the index of any proper subgroup of $\pi_l(\Lambda)$ is at least l.

Let $\Gamma^\circ := \Gamma \cap \mathbb{G}^\circ$. So Γ° is Zariski-dense in $\mathbb{G}^\circ$. Since $[\pi_l(\Lambda) : \pi_l(\Lambda \cap \Gamma^\circ)] \leq [\Gamma : \Gamma^\circ]$, for large enough prime l we have that $\pi_l(\Lambda) = \pi_l(\Lambda \cap \Gamma^\circ)$.

On the other hand, the quotient map $\mathbb{G}^\circ \xrightarrow{f} (\mathbb{G}^\circ)^{\mathrm{ab}} := \mathbb{G}^\circ/[\mathbb{G}^\circ, \mathbb{G}^\circ]$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Hence after realizing $(\mathbb{G}^\circ)^{\mathrm{ab}}$ as a subgroup of $(\mathbb{GL}_{n'})_{\mathbb{Q}}$, for large enough l we have that $\pi_l(f(\Gamma^\circ))$ is a homomorphic image of $\pi_l(\Gamma^\circ)^{\mathrm{ab}} := \pi_l(\Gamma^\circ)/[\pi_l(\Gamma^\circ), \pi_l(\Gamma^\circ)]$. Suppose to the contrary that $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ is not perfect. Then $f(\Gamma^\circ)$ is a finitely generated, infinite, abelian group as it is a Zariski-dense subgroup of $(\mathbb{G}^\circ)^{\mathrm{ab}}$. Hence $|\pi_l(f(\Gamma^\circ))| \to \infty$ as l goes to infinity, which implies that $|\pi_l(f(\Gamma^\circ \cap \Lambda))| \to \infty$. Since $\pi_l(f(\Gamma^\circ \cap \Lambda))$ is abelian and a homomorphic image of $\pi_l(\Gamma^\circ \cap \Lambda)$, we get a contradiction. □

Now we can give an alternative proof of the main result of [CT12, CT13].

Proposition 7. *In the above setting, for any integer d and any prime ℓ there is an integer $B := B(d, \ell, \rho_0)$ such that*

$$U_{d,\ell} := \{x \in U(\overline{k}) |\ [k(x) : k] \leq d, [\Gamma_\ell : \mathrm{Im}(\rho_{\ell,x}) \cap \Gamma_\ell] > B\},$$

is finite.

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that there is a sequence $\{x_i\}$ of points in $U(\overline{k})$ such that

(1) $x_i \neq x_j$ if $i \neq j$,
(2) $[k(x_i) : k] \leq d$,
(3) $[\Gamma_\ell : \mathrm{Im}(\rho_{\ell,x_i}) \cap \Gamma_\ell] = N_i$ where $N_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$, and $N_i \to \infty$.

By Lemma 30, there is an increasing sequence $\{m_i\}_i$ of positive integers and a sequence of open subgroups $\{H_i\}_i$ of Γ_ℓ such that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} [\Gamma_\ell : H_i] = \infty,\ \Gamma_\ell \cap \mathrm{Im}(\rho_{\ell,x_i}) \subseteq H_i, \text{and}\ \ \Gamma_\ell[\ell^{m_i}] \subseteq H_i.$$

Going to a subsequence, if necessary, we can and will assume that $\pi_{\ell^{m_i}}(H_i) = \pi_{\ell^{m_i}}(H_j)$ for any $j \geq i$. Therefore we can and will assume that $H_1 \supsetneq H_2 \supsetneq \cdots$.

For each i, we get an open subgroup of $\pi_1^{et}(U \times_k \overline{k})$, and so we get an étale cover $U_i \xrightarrow{\phi_i} U$ of U that is defined over k. Since $\mathrm{Im}(\rho_{\ell,x_i}) \subseteq H_i$, there is $\widetilde{x}_i \in U_i(k(x_i))$ which is in the fiber over $x_i \in U(k(x_i))$. Moreover, since $\{H_i\}_i$ is a decreasing sequence of open subgroups, we get k-étale covering maps $U_j \xrightarrow{\phi_{ij}} U_i$ for any $i \leq j$ that satisfy $\phi_i \circ \phi_{ij} = \phi_j$. In particular, we have that

$$\{\phi_{ij}(\widetilde{x}_j)\}_j \subseteq \bigcup_{[k':k]\leq d} U_i(k') \tag{4}$$

is an infinite subset for any i. On the other hand, since $\pi_1^{et}(U_i \times_k \overline{k})$ is the profinite closure of $\pi_1(U_i(\mathbb{C}), x_0)$, the natural embedding induces an isomorphism between the Schreier graphs

$$\mathrm{Sch}(\pi_1(U(\mathbb{C}), x_0)/\pi_1(U_i(\mathbb{C}), \widetilde{x}_{0,i}); \Omega) \simeq \mathrm{Sch}(\pi_{\ell^{m_i}}(\Gamma_\ell)/\pi_{\ell^{m_i}}(H_i); \pi_{\ell^{m_i}}(\Omega)), \tag{5}$$

where $\widetilde{x}_{0,i}$ is a point over x_0. On the other hand, by Lemma 6 and Theorem 1, we have that

$$\{\mathrm{Cay}(\pi_{\ell^{m_i}}(\Gamma); \pi_{\ell^{m_i}}(\Omega)\}_i \tag{6}$$

is a family of expanders. Since the Schreier graphs in (5) are quotients of the Cayley graphs in (6) and their size goes to infinity, they form a family of expanders. Therefore by the main result of Ellenberg-Hall-Kowalski [EHK12, Theorem 8] we have that the (geometric) gonality $\gamma(U_i)$ of U_i goes to infinity. Hence by a corollary [CT13, Theorem 2.1] of Falting's theorem [Fal91] on Lang-Mordell conjecture (see [Fer94, Mc95, Maz00]) we have that

$$\bigcup_{[k':k]\leq d} U_i(k')$$

is finite for large enough i. This contradicts (4). □

Acknowledgments.

I would like to thank Adrian Ioana for pointing out the application of spectral gap to orbit rigidity. I am thankful to Cristian Popescu for the useful conversations regarding the ℓ-adic Galois representations. Special thanks are due to Efim Zelmanov for his support and encouragement.

2. Preliminary results.

2.1. **Necessity.** In this section, we will prove that getting a family of expanders modulo an infinite sequence of integers implies that the connected component of the Zariski-closure is perfect. In particular, we get the necessary part of Theorem 1.

Let us remark that proof of [SGV12, Section 5.1] can be adjusted to give the necessary part of Theorem 1 for any fixed prime p. The main point being that the proof in [SGV12] makes use of the fact that the congruence kernels modulo square-free numbers define a topology.

Proposition 8. *Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$ and $\Gamma = \langle\Omega\rangle \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$. Let $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ be the Zariski-connected component of the Zariski-closure $\mathbb{G}$ of Γ in $(\mathbb{GL}_n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. If $\{\mathrm{Cay}(\pi_{q_i}(\Gamma), \pi_{q_i}(\Omega))\}_i$ is a family of expanders for integers $q_1 < q_2 < \cdots$ coprime with q_0, then $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ is perfect, i.e. $[\mathbb{G}^\circ, \mathbb{G}^\circ] = \mathbb{G}^\circ$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma^\circ := \Gamma \cap \mathbb{G}^\circ$. Then, by [SG-b, Lemma 12], Γ° has a finite symmetric generating set Ω° and

$$\{\mathrm{Cay}(\pi_{q_i}(\Gamma^\circ), \pi_{q_i}(\Omega^\circ))\}_i$$

is a family of expanders. Therefore for some positive integer C we have $|\pi_{q_i}(\Gamma^\circ)/[\pi_{q_i}(\Gamma^\circ), \pi_{q_i}(\Gamma^\circ)]| < C$ for any i.

On the other hand, $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ and $[\mathbb{G}^\circ, \mathbb{G}^\circ]$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-groups, and the quotient map $\mathbb{G}^\circ \xrightarrow{f} \mathbb{G}^\circ/[\mathbb{G}^\circ, \mathbb{G}^\circ]$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-homomorphism. Therefore $\mathbb{G}^\circ/[\mathbb{G}^\circ, \mathbb{G}^\circ]$ can be viewed as a $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $\mathbb{GL}_{n'}$ such that first the quotient map f induces a $\mathbb{Q}$-homomorphism from $\mathbb{G}$ to $\mathbb{GL}_{n'}$ and second $f(\Gamma^\circ) \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_{n'}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$. So there is an integer q' such that for any prime p we have $\|f(\gamma) - I\|_p \leq |q'|_p^{-1}\|\gamma - I\|_p$. Therefore f induces an epimorphism from $\pi_{q_i}(\Gamma^\circ)/[\pi_{q_i}(\Gamma^\circ), \pi_{q_i}(\Gamma^\circ)]$ onto $\pi_{q_i/\gcd(q_i,q')}(f(\Gamma^\circ))$. Hence for any i we have

$$|\pi_{q_i/\gcd(q_i,q')}(f(\Gamma^\circ))| < C.$$

Since $f(\Gamma^\circ)$ is a Zariski-dense subset of $\mathbb{G}^\circ/[\mathbb{G}^\circ, \mathbb{G}^\circ]$ and modulo arbitrarily large integers it has at most C elements, we have that $\mathbb{G}^\circ/[\mathbb{G}^\circ, \mathbb{G}^\circ]$ is finite. So by the connectedness we have that $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ is perfect. □

2.2. **A few reductions.** In this section, we make a few reductions and describe the group structure of $\pi_Q(\Gamma)$ using strong approximation [Nor89].

Lemma 9. *It is enough to prove the sufficiency part of Theorem 1 under the following additional assumptions on the Zariski-closure $\mathbb{G}$ of Γ in $(\mathbb{GL}_{n_0})_{\mathbb{Q}}$:*

There are connected, simply-connected, semisimple $\mathbb{Q}$-group $\mathbb{G}_s$, and unipotent $\mathbb{Q}$-group $\mathbb{U}$ such that $\mathbb{G}_s$ acts on $\mathbb{U}$ and $\mathbb{G} \simeq \mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{U}$.

Proof. By the assumption, $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ is a perfect group. Therefore the radical of $\mathbb{G}^\circ$ is unipotent. Let $\widetilde{\mathbb{G}}_s$ be the simply-connected cover of $\mathbb{G}_s$, and $\iota : \widetilde{\mathbb{G}}_s \ltimes \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{U} = \mathbb{G}^\circ$ be the induced covering map. As in [SG-b, Section 2.3] it is enough to prove Theorem 1 for Λ instead of Γ, where

$$\Lambda := \iota(\iota^{-1}(\Gamma \cap \mathbb{G}^\circ(\mathbb{Q})) \cap \widetilde{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbb{Q})).$$

This implies the claim. □

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathbb{G}$ be the Zariski-closure of Γ in $(\mathbb{GL}_{n_0})_{\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0]}$ and $(\mathbb{GL}_{n_0})_{\mathbb{Q}}$, respectively. Let $\mathbb{G}_s$ a semisimple $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$, and $\mathbb{U}$ be a unipotent $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$ such that $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{U}$.*

It is enough to prove the sufficiency part of Theorem 1 under the following additional assumptions on the closure $\widehat{\Gamma}$ of in $\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$:

1. *$\widehat{\Gamma} = \prod_{p\nmid q_0} P_p$ is an open compact subgroup of $\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.*
2. *$P_p = K_p \ltimes U_p$ where K_p is an open compact subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and U_p is an open compact subgroup of $\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.*
3. *There is a prime p_0 such that, for $p \geq p_0$, $K_p = \mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is a hyperspecial parahoric subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, and $U_p = \mathbb{U}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.*
4. *For $p \geq p_0$, the dimension of any non-trivial irreducible representation of $\pi_p(\Gamma) \simeq \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is at least $|\pi_p(\Gamma)|^{O_{\dim \mathbb{G}}(1)}$.*

Proof. By [SG-b, Lemma 2.3], we are allowed to pass to a finite-index subgroup of Γ if needed. By Lemma 9 we can and will assume that $\mathbb{G}$ is connected, simply-connected, and perfect. Hence by Strong approximation we have that $\widehat{\Gamma}$ is an open subgroup of $\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. So passing to a finite-index subgroup we get part 1. Since the action of $\mathbb{G}_s$ on $\mathbb{U}$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, one gets part 2 and part 3. Now by [SGV12, Section 3, Section 4.2] and [LS74] we get the lower bound on $\pi_p(\Gamma)$. □

We notice that the restriction of π_q to Γ factors through $\widehat{\Gamma}$, and so

$$\pi_{\prod_i p_i^{n_i}}(\Gamma) \simeq \prod_i \pi_{p_i^{n_i}}(P_{p_i}) \simeq \prod_i \pi_{p_i^{n_i}}(K_{p_i}) \ltimes \pi_{p_i^{n_i}}(U_{p_i}).$$

2.3. **Algebraic homomorphisms and the congruence maps.** Here we make an easy observation which is essentially based on the fact that a $\mathbb{Q}$-homomorphism $\rho : \mathbb{H}_1 \to \mathbb{H}_2$ between two algebraic $\mathbb{Q}$-groups $\mathbb{H}_1$ and $\mathbb{H}_2$ induces a continuous homomorphism between the adelic points $\mathbb{H}_1(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ and $\mathbb{H}_2(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$. This implies that a $\mathbb{Q}$-homomorphism $\rho : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{GL}_n$ almost commutes with π_q. This will be used for the quotient maps onto $\mathbb{G}_s$ or $\mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{U}/[\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}]$ where $\mathbb{G}_s$ is a Levi $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$, $\mathbb{U}$ is the unipotent radical of $\mathbb{G}$.

Lemma 11. *Let $\mathbb{H} \subseteq \mathbb{GL}_{n_1}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup (with a given embedding). Let $\rho : \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{GL}_{n_2}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-homomorphism. Then the following hold.*

1. *There is $g \in \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\rho(\mathbb{H} \cap \mathrm{GL}_{n_1}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])) \subseteq g\,\mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])g^{-1}$.*
2. *There is a positive integer q' such that for any prime p*

$$\|\rho(h) - 1\|_p \leq |q'|_p^{-1} \|h - 1\|_p.$$

(3) *Let $1 \to \mathbb{L} \to \mathbb{H} \xrightarrow{\rho} \bar{\mathbb{H}} \to 1$ be a short exact sequence. Suppose there is a $\mathbb{Q}$-section $s : \bar{\mathbb{H}} \to \mathbb{H}$ such that $s(1) = 1$. Let $\prod_{p\nmid q_0} Q_p$ be a compact open subgroup of $\mathbb{H}(\mathbb{A}(S_0))$ where S_0 is the set of prime divisors of q_0. Assume that $Q_p = \mathbb{H} \cap \mathrm{GL}_{n_1}^{k_p}(\mathbb{Z}_p) = \{h_p \in \mathbb{H}(\mathbb{Q}_p) |\ \|h_p - 1\| \le p^{-k_p}\}$, $\rho(Q_p) \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, and $s(\rho(Q_p)) \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_{n_1}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ for any prime p. Then there is a positive integer $q' = \prod_p p^{k'_p}$ such that for positive integers $n_p \ge k'_p + k_p$ we have*

$$\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \pi_{p^{n_p+k'_p}}(Q_p)/\pi_{p^{n_p+k'_p}}(\mathbb{L}\cap Q_p) \twoheadrightarrow \prod_{p\nmid q_0} \pi_{p^{n_p}}(\rho(Q_p)) \twoheadrightarrow \prod_{p\nmid q_0} \pi_{p^{n_p-k'_p}}(Q_p)/\pi_{p^{n_p-k'_p}}(\mathbb{L}\cap Q_p). \tag{7}$$

Proof. For any p there is $g_p \in \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ such that $g_p\rho(\mathbb{H}\cap \mathrm{GL}_{n_1}(\mathbb{Z}_p))g_p^{-1} \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Since ρ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, for large enough p, we can assume that $g_p = 1$. Hence there is $\widehat{g} = (g_p) \in \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ such that

$$\widehat{g}\Delta(\rho(\mathbb{H}\cap \mathrm{GL}_{n_1}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])))\widehat{g}^{-1} \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{R}) \prod_{p|q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}_p).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}) = \Delta(\mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Q}))\cdot \left(\mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{R}) \prod_{p|q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}_p)\right),$$

where Δ is the diagonal embedding. So there is $g \in \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Q})$ such that

$$\Delta(g\rho(\mathbb{H}\cap \mathrm{GL}_{n_1}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0]))g^{-1}) \subseteq \left(\mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{R}) \prod_{p|q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}_p)\right) \cap \Delta(\mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Q})) = \Delta(\mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])),$$

which gives us the first part.

The second part is an easy consequence of the fact that ρ can be represented by a polynomial with rational coefficients. Similarly there is a positive integer q' such that

$$|q'|_p \|s(\rho(h_p)) - 1\|_p \le \|\rho(h_p) - 1\|_p \le |q'|_p^{-1}\|h_p - 1\|_p,$$

for any prime p and $h_p \in \mathbb{H}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. On the other hand, $h_p \in \ker(\pi_{p^n} \circ \rho)$ if and only if $\|\rho(h_p) - 1\|_p \le p^{-n}$. This implies that $\pi_{p^{n-k'_p}}(s(\rho(h_p))) = 1$. Thus $h_p = (h_p s(\rho(h_p))^{-1}) \cdot s(\rho(h_p)) \in (\mathbb{L}\cap Q_p)\ker \pi_{p^{n-k'_p}}$, which implies that

$$\pi_{p^{n_p}}(\rho(Q_p)) \twoheadrightarrow \prod_p \pi_{p^{n_p-k'_p}}(Q_p)/\pi_{p^{n_p-k'_p}}(\mathbb{L}\cap Q_p).$$

By a similar argument, proof can be completed. □

Let $\mathbb{G}_s$ be a simply connected semisimple $\mathbb{Q}$-group which acts on a unipotent $\mathbb{Q}$-group $\mathbb{U}$. Then by the virtue of [SGV12, Corollary 14] $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{U}$ is a perfect group if and only if $\mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{U}/[\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}]$ is perfect. On the other hand, $\mathbb{V} := \mathbb{U}/[\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}]$ is a vector $\mathbb{Q}$-group, and the action of $\mathbb{G}_s$ on $\mathbb{U}$ induces a representation $\phi_0 : \mathbb{G}_s \to \mathbb{GL}(\mathbb{V})$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. And $\mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{V}$ is perfect if and only if the trivial representation is not a subrepresentation of ϕ_0. Consider the following short exact sequences of $\mathbb{Q}$-algebraic groups

$$1 \to \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{G} \xrightarrow{\rho_1} \mathbb{G}_s \to 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad 1 \to [\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}] \to \mathbb{G} \xrightarrow{\rho_2} \mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{V} \to 1. \tag{8}$$

We notice that, since the $\mathbb{U}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-unipotent group, there is a $\mathbb{Q}$-section from $\mathbb{V}$ to $\mathbb{U}$, which can be extended to a $\mathbb{Q}$-section for the second exact sequence of (8). The first exact sequence clearly splits. We fix certain $\mathbb{Q}$-embeddings $\mathbb{G}_s \subseteq \mathbb{G} \subseteq \mathbb{GL}_{n_1}$ and $\mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{GL}_{n_2}$. Let $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{G} \cap \mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$ be a Zariski-dense subgroup. Then by Lemma 11 after passing to a finite index subgroup if necessary, we can assume that $\rho_2(\Gamma) \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$. By the above comment, we are also allowed to use (7) in Lemma 11 for the p-adic closure of Γ in $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ for any $p \nmid q_0$.

2.4. **Ping-pong players.** As in [SGV12, SG-b], we work with a free Zariski-dense subgroup of Γ. Following [SG-b, Proposition 18], using [SGV12, Proposition 6, Proposition 16, Proposition 19] we get the following.

Proposition 12. *Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q})$ which generates a Zariski-dense subgroup Γ of a Zariski-connected perfect group $\mathbb{G}$. Then there are a finite subset $\overline{\Omega'}$ of Γ and $\delta_0 > 0$ and l_0 (which depend on Ω) such that $\overline{\Omega'}$ freely generates a Zariski-dense subgroup of $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q})$ and*

$$\mathcal{P}^{(l)}_{\Omega'}(\mathbb{H}(F)) \leq e^{-\delta_0 l} \tag{9}$$

for any field extension $F/\mathbb{Q}$, and any proper subgroup $\mathbb{H} \subsetneq \mathbb{G} \times_{\mathbb{Q}} F$ and $l \geq l_0$, where $\Omega' = \overline{\Omega'} \cup \overline{\Omega'}^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_\Omega$ is the probability counting measure on Ω. Moreover, $\mathrm{Ad}(\rho_1(\overline{\Omega'}))$ freely generates a subgroup of $\mathrm{Ad}(\mathbb{G}_s)$, where $\rho_1 : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{G}_s$ is the quotient map; in particular, $\ker(\mathrm{Ad} \circ \rho_1) \cap \langle \Omega' \rangle = \{1\}$.

Proof. By [SGV12, Proposition 16 and Proposition 19], there are l_0, $c > 0$ and $\overline{\Omega'}$ such that $\overline{\Omega'}$ freely generates a subgroup of Γ and

$$|B_l(\overline{\Omega'}) \cap \mathbb{H}^\circ(F)| < |B_l(\overline{\Omega'})|^{1-c},$$

for any $l \geq l_0$, where $B_l(\overline{\Omega'})$ is the set of reduced words over $\overline{\Omega'}$ of length at most l and $\mathbb{H}^\circ$ is the Zariski-connected component of $\mathbb{H}$. Now using a result of Kesten [Kes59, Theorem 3] and Cauchy-Schwartz as in the proof of [SGV12, Proposition 6], we have

$$\mathcal{P}^{(l)}_{\Omega'}(\mathbb{H}^\circ(F)) \leq e^{-\delta_0 l}. \tag{10}$$

Furthermore by the virtue of the proof of [SGV12, Proposition 21] (where the ping-pong players are constructed) we can make sure that $\mathrm{Ad}(\rho_1(\overline{\Omega'}))$ freely generates a subgroup of $\mathrm{Ad}(\mathbb{G}_s)$, where $\rho_1 : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{G}_s$ is as in Section 2.2. If $\mathbb{H}$ is not Zariski-connected, then $\rho_1(\mathbb{H})$ is a proper subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_s$. Hence, by [SG-b, Proposition 18] and the above remark, we have

$$\mathcal{P}^{(l)}_{\Omega'}(\mathbb{H}(F)) \leq e^{-\delta_0 l}.$$

And if $\mathbb{H}$ is Zariski-connected, we are done by (10). □

Lemma 13. *Let Ω be a finite symmetric subset of $\mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$ and $\Gamma = \langle \Omega \rangle$. Assume the Zariski-closure $\mathbb{G}$ of Γ is a connected, simply connected, perfect $\mathbb{Q}$-group. Suppose $\Omega' \subseteq \Gamma$ is a finite symmetric set which generates a Zariski-dense subgroup Λ of $\mathbb{G}$. Then for any set of positive integers $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of integers coprime to q_0 if $\{\mathrm{Cay}(\pi_q(\Lambda), \pi_q(\Omega'))\}_{q \in \mathcal{C}}$ is a family of expanders, then $\{\mathrm{Cay}(\pi_q(\Gamma), \pi_q(\Omega))\}_{q \in \mathcal{C}}$ is a family of expanders.*

Proof. By Nori's strong approximation, we have that the closure $\widehat{\Lambda}$ of Λ in $\prod_{p \nmid q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is of finite index in the closure $\widehat{\Gamma}$ of Γ in $\prod_{p \nmid q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. For any q, any representation ρ of $\pi_q(\Gamma)$ can be viewed as a representation of $\widehat{\Gamma}$. Only finitely many of them have $\widehat{\Lambda}$ in their kernel. Hence the restriction to Λ of only finitely many such representation is trivial. Let ρ be an irreducible representation of Γ whose restriction to Λ is not trivial. The extension of ρ to $\widehat{\Gamma}$ is also denoted by ρ. The restriction of ρ to Λ is a subrepresentation of $l_0^2(\pi_q(\Lambda))$.

Let $u \in V_\rho$ be a unit vector which is an ε-almost invariant vector with respect to Ω, i.e.

$$\|\rho(\gamma)(u) - u\| < \varepsilon,$$

for any $\gamma \in \Omega$. Since Ω generates Γ and $\Omega' \subseteq \Gamma$, for some r_0 we have $\Omega' \subseteq \prod_{r_0} \Omega$. Thus for any $\lambda \in \Omega'$ we have

$$\|\rho(\lambda)(u) - (u)\| < r_0 \varepsilon.$$

Assuming $\{\mathrm{Cay}(\pi_q(\Lambda), \pi_q(\Omega'))\}_{q \in \mathcal{C}}$ is a family of expanders, there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\max_{\lambda \in \Omega'} \|\rho(\lambda)(u) - u\| > \varepsilon_0.$$

Therefore $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0 / r_0$, which implies that no non-trivial irreducible representation of $\pi_q(\Gamma)$ (for $q \in \mathcal{C}$) has an ε'-almost invariant vector for some $\varepsilon' > 0$. □

Corollary 14. *It is enough to prove the sufficiency part of Theorem 1 under the additional assumptions:*

(1) $\Omega = \overline{\Omega} \cup \overline{\Omega}^{-1}$ *where* $\overline{\mathrm{Ad}(\rho_1(\Omega))}$ *freely generates a Zariski-dense subgroup of* $\mathrm{Ad}(\mathbb{G}_s)$.
(2) *For any proper subgroup* $\mathbb{H}$, *(9) holds.*

Remark 15. *Notice that by changing* Ω, *the closure* Γ_p *of* Γ *in* $\mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ *is of the form described in Lemma 10 only for large enough* p. *For small primes* Γ_p *is still an open subgroup of* $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

2.5. **Summary of the initial reductions.** In the rest of the article, we assume that $\Omega \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0])$ is as in Corollary 14. Let $\Gamma = \langle \Omega \rangle$, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathbb{G}$ be the Zariski-closure of Γ in $(\mathrm{GL}_{n_0})_{\mathbb{Z}[1/q_0]}$ and $(\mathrm{GL}_{n_0})_{\mathbb{Q}}$, respectively. By Lemma 10 and Remark 15, we can and will assume that $\mathbb{G}$ is a connected, simply connected, perfect group and the closure $\widehat{\Gamma}$ of Γ in $\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is an open subgroup of $\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ which contains a finite index subgroup of the form $\prod_{p\nmid q_0} P_p$ where $P_p = K_p \ltimes U_p$ and K_p and U_p satisfy the properties mentioned in Lemma 10. In particular, for $p \geq p_0$, we have that the smallest degree of a non-trivial irreducible representation of $\pi_p(\Gamma)$ is at least $|\pi_p(\Gamma)|^{O_{\dim \mathbb{G}}(1)}$.

3. Expansion, approximate subgroup, and bounded generation.

3.1. **Largeness of level-Q approximate subgroups implies super-approximation.** We work in the setting of Section 2.5. Following [SG-b] let us introduce the following notation for convenience: for a finite symmetric subset A of Γ, positive integers l and Q, and a positive number δ, let $\mathfrak{P}_Q(\delta, A, l)$ be the following statement

$$(\mathcal{P}_\Omega^{(l)}(A) > Q^{-\delta}) \ \wedge \ (l > \frac{1}{\delta}\log Q) \ \wedge \ (|\pi_Q(A\cdot A\cdot A)| \leq |\pi_Q(A)|^{1+\delta}). \tag{11}$$

One can think of A as a *generic level-Q approximate subgroup* if $\mathfrak{P}_Q(\delta, A, l)$ holds for small enough δ.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be either $\{p^n | p \in V_f(\mathbb{Q}), p \nmid q_0\}$ or $\{q \in \mathbb{Z}^+ |\ \gcd(q, q_0) = 1,\ \forall p \in V_f(\mathbb{Q}), v_p(q_0) \leq N\}$, where $v_p(q)$ is the p-adic valuation of q.

In this section, we point out that as in [SG-b] one can deduce Theorem 1 from the following result.

Theorem 16 (Approximate subgroups)**.** *In the above setting, for any* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there is* $\delta > 0$ *such that*

$$\mathfrak{P}_Q(\delta, A, l) \text{ implies that } |\pi_Q(A)| \geq |\pi_Q(\Gamma)|^{1-\varepsilon}$$

if $Q \in \mathcal{C}$ *and* $Q^{\varepsilon^{\Theta_{\mathbb{G}}(1)}} \gg_\Omega 1$.

Proof of Theorem 1 modulo Theorem 16. We notice that the same proof as in [SG-b, Proposition 28] and [SG-b, Section 3.2] goes through without any change. □

3.2. **Reduction to bounded generation and abelian unipotent radical.** The main goal of this section is to deduce Theorem 16 from the following.

Theorem 17 (Bounded generation)**.** *In the setting of Section 2.5, suppose* $\mathbb{U}$ *is abelian. Then for any* $0 < \varepsilon \ll_\Omega 1$ *there are* $0 < \delta \ll_{\Omega,\varepsilon} 1$ *and positive integer* $C \gg_{\Omega,\varepsilon} 1$ *such that for a finite symmetric subset* A *of* Γ

$$\mathcal{P}_\Omega^{(l)}(A) > Q^{-\delta} \text{ for some } l > \log Q/\delta \text{ implies } \pi_Q(\Gamma[q]) \subseteq \textstyle\prod_C \pi_Q(A) \text{ for some } q|Q \text{ such that } q \leq Q^\varepsilon$$

if $Q \in \mathcal{C}$ *and* $Q^{\varepsilon^{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)}} \gg_\Omega 1$.

Theorem 17 implies Theorem 16. By the contrary assumption, there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\delta > 0$ there are a finite symmetric subset A_δ, a positive integer l_δ and $Q_\delta \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathfrak{P}_{Q_\delta}(\delta, A_\delta, l_\delta)$ holds and at the same time $|\pi_{Q_\delta}(A_\delta)| < |\pi_{Q_\delta}(\Gamma)|^{1-\varepsilon_0}$. Since $l_\delta > \log Q_\delta/\delta$, we have $\lim_{\delta\to 0} l_\delta = \infty$. Now we claim that

$Q_\delta \to \infty$ as $\delta \to 0$. If not, for infinitely many δ we have $Q_\delta = Q$, and $\pi_Q(A_\delta) = \overline{A}$ is independent of δ. And so

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \pi_Q[\mathcal{P}]^{(l_\delta)}(\pi_Q(A_\delta)) = \frac{|\overline{A}|}{|\pi_Q(\Gamma)|} < \frac{1}{|\pi_Q(\Gamma)|^{\varepsilon_0}}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\pi_Q[\mathcal{P}]^{(l_\delta)}(\pi_Q(A_\delta)) \geq \mathcal{P}^{(l_\delta)}(A_\delta) > Q_\delta^{-\delta} = Q^{-\delta}.$$

Hence as $\delta \to 0$, we get $|\pi_Q(\Gamma)|^{-\varepsilon_0} > 1$, which is a contradiction.

Let $\{k_p\}_{p\nmid q_0}$ be such that $P_p \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)[p^{k_p}]$ where $\{P_p\}_p$ is as in Section 2.5. Let $\rho_2 : \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{U}/[\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}]$ be as in Section 2.3. Let us recall that we can and will assume $\rho_2(P_p) \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

Let $q_0' = \prod_{p\nmid q_0} p^{k_p'}$ be a positive integer given by Lemma 11, i.e. for any sequence $\{m_p\}_{p\nmid q_0} \in \bigoplus_{p\nmid q_0} \mathbb{Z}$ such that $m_p \geq k_p + k_p'$ we have

$$\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \pi_{p^{m_p+k_p'}}(P_p)/\pi_{p^{m_p+k_p'}}([\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}]\cap P_p) \twoheadrightarrow \prod_{p\nmid q_0} \pi_{p^{m_p}}(\rho_2(P_p)) \twoheadrightarrow \prod_{p\nmid q_0} \pi_{p^{m_p-k_p'}}(P_p)/\pi_{p^{m_p-k_p'}}([\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}]\cap P_p). \tag{12}$$

In order to use (12), we modify Q_δ so that for any prime p either $v_p(Q_\delta) \geq k_p'$ or $v_p(Q_\delta) = 0$. To this end, it is enough to show that we are allowed to change Q_δ to Q_δ/q_δ' where $q_\delta' := \prod_{p\nmid q_0, 0<v_p(Q_\delta)<2k_p'+k_p} p^{v_p(Q_\delta)}$.

Lemma 18. *Let A_δ, Q_δ, and l_δ be as above. Suppose $q_\delta'|Q_\delta$ and $q_\delta' < C'$ (for some constant C'). Then $\mathfrak{P}_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(\Theta(\delta), A_\delta, l_\delta)$ holds and $|\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(A_\delta)| \leq |\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(\Gamma)|^{1-\varepsilon_0/2}$ for $0 < \delta \ll_{C'} 1$.*

Proof. Since $\lim_{\delta\to 0} Q_\delta = \infty$, for large enough C'' and small enough δ we have $Q_\delta/q_\delta' > Q_\delta^{1/C''}$. And so

$$\mathcal{P}^{(l_\delta)}(A_\delta) > Q_\delta^{-\delta} > (Q_\delta/q_\delta')^{-C''\delta}, \text{ and} \qquad l_\delta > \frac{\log Q_\delta}{\delta} > \frac{\log(Q_\delta/q_\delta')}{C''\delta}.$$

To show that $\mathfrak{P}_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(C''\delta, A_\delta, l_\delta)$ holds, it is enough to prove that we have $|\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(\prod_3 A_\delta)| \leq |\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(A_\delta)|^{1+C''\delta}$ for large enough C''.

We notice that, if c is small enough (depending on Ω), $\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}$ induces an injection on the ball of radius $c\log(Q_\delta/q_\delta')$ (with respect to the word metric). By [BG09, Remark, page 1060] (see [SG-b, Lemma 6]), we have $\mathcal{P}^{(\lfloor c\log(Q_\delta/q_\delta')\rfloor)}(A_\delta \cdot A_\delta) > Q_\delta^{-2\delta}$. Hence by the Kesten bound for small enough δ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(A_\delta \cdot A_\delta)| &= |A_\delta \cdot A_\delta \cap B_{\lfloor c\log(Q_\delta/q_\delta')\rfloor}| \\ &\geq \mathcal{P}^{(\lfloor c\log(Q_\delta/q_\delta')\rfloor)}(A_\delta \cdot A_\delta)/\|\mathcal{P}^{(\lfloor c\log(Q_\delta/q_\delta')\rfloor)}\|_\infty \\ &\geq Q_\delta^{-2\delta} \cdot (c\log(Q_\delta/q_\delta'))^{\Theta_\Omega(1)} \geq Q_\delta^{\Theta_{C',\Omega}(1)}, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

which implies that $|\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(A_\delta)| \geq Q_\delta^{\Theta_{C',\Omega}(1)}$.

Since $|\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_3 A_\delta)| \leq |\prod_{Q_\delta}(A_\delta)|^{1+\delta}$, by [Hel11, Lemma 7.4] we have

$$|\pi_{Q_\delta}(A_\delta)|^{3\delta} \geq \frac{|\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_5 A_\delta)|}{|\pi_{Q_\delta}(A_\delta)|} \geq \frac{|\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(\prod_3 A_\delta)|}{|\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(A_\delta)|},$$

which implies that $|\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(\prod_3 A_\delta)|/|\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(A_\delta)| \leq |\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(A_\delta)|^{C''\delta}$ for large enough C''. Since Q_δ goes to infinity, it is clear that for small enough δ we have $|\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(A_\delta)| \leq |\pi_{Q_\delta/q_\delta'}(\Gamma)|^{1-\varepsilon_0/2}$. □

By Lemma 18 we can and will modify $\{Q_\delta\}_\delta$ and assume that, if $k_p + k_p' > 0$, then either $v_p(Q_\delta) = 0$ for any δ or $k_p + 2k_p' \leq \min_\delta v_p(Q_\delta) < \sup_\delta v_p(Q_\delta) = \infty$. In particular, without loss of generality we can and will assume that $q_0'^2|Q_\delta$ for any δ.

On the other hand, by Corollary 14, we have that $\ker(\rho_2)\cap\Gamma=\{1\}$. So $\mathcal{P}^{(l_\delta)}_{\rho_2(\Omega)}(\rho_2(A_\delta))=\mathcal{P}^{(l_\delta)}_{\Omega}(A_\delta)>Q_\delta^{-\delta}>(q_0'Q_\delta)^{-\Theta(\delta)}$ for suitable constant and small enough δ. Hence by Theorem 17 for any $0<\varepsilon'\ll_\Omega 1$ there is a positive integer $C=O_{\Omega,\varepsilon'}(1)$ such that for any $0<\delta\ll_{\varepsilon',\Omega}1$ we have

$$\pi_{q_0'Q_\delta}(\rho_2(\Gamma)[q_\delta])\subseteq\prod_C\pi_{q_0'Q_\delta}(\rho_2(A_\delta)) \tag{14}$$

for some $q_\delta|q_0'Q_\delta$ and $q_\delta\leq(q_0'Q_\delta)^{\varepsilon'}\leq Q_\delta^{\Theta(\varepsilon')}$.

On the other hand we have $\pi_{q_0'Q_\delta}(\prod_{p\nmid q_0}\rho_2(U_p))\subseteq\pi_{q_0'Q_\delta}(\rho_2(\Gamma))$. Let $\overline{U}_p:=\mathrm{GL}_{n_2}(\mathbb{Z}_p)\cap\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. We know that $\overline{U}_p=U_p$ for large enough p, and U_p is an open subgroup of $\overline{U}_p$. By Lemma 18, we can and will assume that $v_p(Q_\delta)$ are either zero or large enough depending on the index of U_p in $\overline{U}_p$ for all the primes p. And so by enlarging q_δ by a multiplicative constant we can and will assume that

$$\pi_{q_0'Q_\delta}(\rho_2(\textstyle\prod_{p\nmid q_0}\overline{U}_p)^{q_\delta})\subseteq\pi_{q_0'Q_\delta}(\rho_2(\Gamma)[q_\delta])\subseteq\prod_C\pi_{q_0'Q_\delta}(\rho_2(A_\delta)),$$

where $\rho_2(\prod_{p\nmid q_0}\overline{U}_p)^{q_\delta}:=\{x^{q_\delta}|\ x\in\rho_2(\prod_{p\nmid q_0}\overline{U}_p)\}$. So there is $B_\delta\subseteq\prod_C A_\delta$ such that

$$\pi_{q_0'Q_\delta}(\rho_2(B_\delta))=\pi_{q_0'Q_\delta}(\rho_2(\prod_{p\nmid q_0}\overline{U}_p)^{q_\delta}). \tag{15}$$

Lemma 19. *Let $\mathbb{U}$ be a unipotent $\mathbb{Q}$-group with a given $\mathbb{Q}$-embedding in $\mathbb{GL}_n$. For any prime p, let $\overline{U}_p:=\mathbb{U}\cap\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Let $\phi:\mathbb{U}\to\mathbb{U}/[\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}]$ be the quotient map. Fix a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ of $(\mathbb{U}/[\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}])(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\phi(\overline{U}_p)\subseteq\sum_i\mathbb{Z}_p\mathbf{e}_i$ for any prime p. Let $q|Q$ be two positive integers. Suppose X is a finite subset of $\prod_p\overline{U}_p$ such $\pi_Q(\phi(X))=\pi_Q(q\sum_i\mathbb{Z}\mathbf{e}_i)$. Then*

$$|\textstyle\prod_C\pi_Q(X)|\geq\frac{|\pi_Q(\prod_p\overline{U}_p))|}{Cq^C},$$

where C depends on the dimension of $\mathbb{U}$ and the choice of embeddings.

Proof. Let $\gamma_i(\mathbb{U})$ be the i-th lower central series, i.e. $\gamma_1(\mathbb{U}):=\mathbb{U}$ and $\gamma_{i+1}(\mathbb{U}):=[\gamma_i(\mathbb{U}),\mathbb{U}]$. It is well-known that long commutators $(g_1,\dots,g_k):=((g_1,\dots,g_{k-1}),g_k)$, where $(g_1,g_2):=g_1^{-1}g_2^{-1}g_1g_2$, induce multilinear maps f_k from $\mathbb{U}/[\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}]\times\cdots\times\mathbb{U}/[\mathbb{U},\mathbb{U}]$ (k times) to $\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})/\gamma_{k+1}(\mathbb{U})$, and the $\mathbb{Q}$-span of $\{f_k(\mathbf{e}_{i_1},\dots,\mathbf{e}_{i_k})\}$ is $(\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})/\gamma_{k+1}(\mathbb{U}))(\mathbb{Q})$. For any k, let $\phi_k:\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})\to\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})/\gamma_{k+1}(\mathbb{U})$. Then for any k we have

$$\pi_Q(\phi_k(\textstyle\prod_{4k}X\cap\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})))\supseteq\cup_{i_1,\dots,i_k}\pi_Q(q^k\mathbb{Z}f_k(\mathbf{e}_{i_1},\dots,\mathbf{e}_{i_k})),$$

and so

$$\pi_Q(\phi_k(\textstyle\prod_{4k\dim\mathbb{U}}X\cap\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})))\supseteq\pi_Q(q^k\sum_{i_1,\dots,i_k}\mathbb{Z}f_k(\mathbf{e}_{i_1},\dots,\mathbf{e}_{i_k}))$$

In particular, we have

$$|\pi_Q(\phi_k(\textstyle\prod_{4k\dim\mathbb{U}}X\cap\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})))|\geq(Q/q^k)^{\dim\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})-\dim\gamma_{k+1}(\mathbb{U})}. \tag{16}$$

Since ϕ_k's are regular morphisms defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, there is a positive integer q_1' depending on the embedding of $\mathbb{U}$ and the choice of $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$) such that for any prime power p^m we have

$$\phi_k(\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})\cap\prod_p\overline{U}_p[q_1'Q])\subseteq\prod_p(Q\sum_{i_1,\dots,i_k}\mathbb{Z}_pf_k(\mathbf{e}_{i_1},\dots,\mathbf{e}_{i_k})).$$

And so ϕ_k induces homomorphism $\overline{\phi}_k:\pi_{q_1'Q}(\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})\cap\prod_p\overline{U}_p)\to\pi_Q(\sum_{i_1,\dots,i_k}\mathbb{Z}f_k(\mathbf{e}_{i_1},\dots,\mathbf{e}_{i_k}))$, i.e. we have $\overline{\phi}_k\circ\pi_{q_1'Q}=\pi_Q\circ\phi_k$. Thus by (16) we have

$$|\pi_{q_1'Q}(\textstyle\prod_{4\dim\mathbb{U}^3}X)|\geq\prod_k|\pi_Q(\phi_k(\prod_{4k\dim\mathbb{U}}X\cap\gamma_k(\mathbb{U})))|\geq(Q/q^{\dim\mathbb{U}})^{\dim\mathbb{U}}. \tag{17}$$

Since $\mathbb{U}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-unipotent, there is a positive integer q_2' (depending on the embedding and $\mathbb{U}$) such that ${q_2'}^{-1}Q^{\dim\mathbb{U}}\leq|\pi_Q(\prod_p\overline{U}_p)|\leq q_2'Q^{\dim\mathbb{U}}$. And so

$$|\pi_Q(\textstyle\prod_{4\dim\mathbb{U}^3}X)|\geq\frac{|\pi_Q(\prod_p\overline{U}_p)|}{{q_2'}^2{q_1'}^{\dim\mathbb{U}}q^{\dim\mathbb{U}^2}}.$$

□

By (15) there is $X_\delta \subseteq \prod_p U_p$ such that $\pi_{q_0' Q_\delta}(X_\delta) = \pi_{q_0' Q_\delta}(B_\delta)$, which implies that $\pi_{Q_\delta}(\rho_2(X_\delta)) = \pi_{Q_\delta}(\rho_2(B_\delta))$. Hence by Lemma 19 we have

$$|\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_{O_{\Omega,\varepsilon'}(1)} A_\delta) \cap \pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \overline{U}_p)| \geq \frac{|\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \overline{U}_p)|}{\Theta_{\dim \mathbb{U}}(1) q_\delta^{\Theta_{\mathbb{U}}(1)}} \geq \frac{|\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_{p\nmid q_0} \overline{U}_p)|}{Q_\delta^{\Theta_{\dim \mathbb{U}}(\varepsilon')}} \geq |\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_{p|Q_\delta} \overline{U}_p)|^{1-\Theta_{\mathbb{U}}(\varepsilon')}, \tag{18}$$

for small enough ε' (depending on ε') as $\lim_{\delta\to 0} Q_\delta = \infty$.

On the other hand, by (14), we have

$$\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_{p\nmid q_0} K_p[q_\delta]) \subseteq \prod_C \pi_{Q_\delta}(A_\delta).$$

Therefore we have

$$|\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_C A_\delta) \cap \pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_{p|Q_\delta} K_p)| \geq |\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_{p|Q_\delta} K_p)|^{1-\Theta_{\mathbb{G}_s}(\varepsilon')}, \tag{19}$$

for small enough δ (depending on ε') as $\lim_{\delta\to 0} Q_\delta = \infty$.

By (18), (19), $\lim_{\delta\to 0} Q_\delta = \infty$, and the fact that $\prod_{p\nmid q_0} K_p \ltimes U_p$ is of finite index in $\widehat{\Gamma}$, we have

$$|\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_C A_\delta)| \geq |\pi_{Q_\delta}(\Gamma)|^{1-\Theta_\Omega(\varepsilon')}, \tag{20}$$

for small enough δ (depending on ε').

On the other hand, since $|\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_3 A_\delta)| \leq |\pi_{Q_\delta}(A_\delta)|^{1+\delta}$ by the Ruzsa inequality (see [Hel05]), we have

$$|\pi_{Q_\delta}(\prod_C A_\delta)| \leq |\pi_{Q_\delta}(A_\delta)|^{1+(C-2)\delta} \leq |\pi_{Q_\delta}(\Gamma)|^{(1-\varepsilon_0)(1+(C-2)\delta)}. \tag{21}$$

By (20) and (21), for any ε' and small enough δ (in particular it can approach zero), we have

$$1 - \Theta_\Omega(\varepsilon') \leq (1-\varepsilon_0)(1+(C(\varepsilon')-2)\delta),$$

which is a contradiction. □

4. Super-approximation: bounded power of square-free integers case.

By Section 3.2, to prove Theorem 1 for $\mathcal{C}_N := \{q \in \mathbb{Z}^+ |\ \forall p \nmid q_0, v_p(q) \leq N\}$ it is enough to prove Theorem 17 (Bounded generation) for $\mathcal{C}_N$. In particular, we can assume that $\mathbb{U}$ is abelian. Since I believe it is interesting to know if some of the auxiliary results are true for more general perfect groups, I do not assume $\mathbb{U}$ is abelian till towards the end of this section. As a result some extra lemmas are proved which are not necessary for the proof of Theorem 17 for $\mathcal{C}_N$.[3]

4.1. **The residue maps do not split.**

The main goal of this section is to show Lemma 23 which roughly asserts that π_p does split under mild conditions.

Lemma 20. *Let $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{H} \ltimes \mathbb{U}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-group with a given $\mathbb{Q}$-embedding into $\mathbb{GL}_n$, where $\mathbb{H}$ is a semisimple $\mathbb{Q}$-group and $\mathbb{U}$ is a unipotent $\mathbb{Q}$-group. Let $\mathcal{G}$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{U}$) be the Zariski-closure of $\mathbb{G}$ (resp. $\mathbb{H}$, $\mathbb{U}$) in $(\mathcal{GL}_n)_\mathbb{Z}$, and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{G})$, $\mathfrak{h} = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{H})$, and $\mathfrak{u} = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{U})$. For large enough p, if $V \subsetneq \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is a $\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$-invariant proper subspace, then $V + [\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p), \mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p)]$ is a proper subspace. Moreover if $\mathbb{G}$ is perfect, then $V + \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is also a proper subspace, where $\mathfrak{z} = \mathrm{Lie}(Z(\mathcal{G}))$ is the Lie ring of the schematic center of $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. Let $A_G := \mathfrak{f}_p[\mathrm{Ad}(\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{f}_p))] \subseteq \mathrm{End}_{\mathfrak{f}_p}(\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p))$ be the $\mathfrak{f}_p$-span of $\mathrm{Ad}(\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{f}_p))$, and $A_H := \mathfrak{f}_p[\mathrm{Ad}(\mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{f}_p))]$ be its subalgebra. Since $\mathbb{H}$ is semisimple, for large enough p, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is a faithful completely reducible A_H-module. Thus A_H is a semisimple algebra, and so its Jacobson radical $J(A_H)$ is zero. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be the ideal generated by $\{u - 1 |\ u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{f}_p)\}$. Then we have the following short exact sequence of A_G-modules:

$$0 \to \mathfrak{a} \to A_G \to A_H \to 0.$$

[3] If the reader is only interested in the proof of Theorem 17 for $\mathcal{C}_N$, s/he can avoid reading Lemma 20, Lemma 21, and Lemma 25.

Since A_H is semisimple, $J(A_G) \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$. On the other hand, since $\mathbb{U}$ is a unipotent normal subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$, $\mathfrak{a}$ is a nilpotent ideal. So overall we have $\mathfrak{a} = J(A_G)$.

Suppose to the contrary that there is a proper A_G-submodule V of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ such that $V + [\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p), \mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p)] = \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$. If we show that $J(A_G)\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p) \supseteq [\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p), \mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p)]$, then we get that $V + J(A_G)\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p) = \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$. And so by Nakayama's lemma we have $V = \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$, which is a contradiction.

Since $\mathbb{U}$ is unipotent, log and exp define $\mathbb{Q}$-morphisms between $\mathbb{U}$ and its Lie algebra. And for large enough p they induce bijections between $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ and $\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$. Furthermore for any $t \in \mathfrak{f}_p$, $x, y \in \mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ we have

$$\mathrm{Ad}(\exp(tx))(y) = \exp(t\,\mathrm{ad}(x))(y). \tag{22}$$

Thus for $t \in \mathfrak{f}_p$, $x, y \in \mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ we have

$$t^{-1}(\mathrm{Ad}(\exp(tx))(y) - y) = [x, y] + \sum_{i=1}^{\dim \mathbb{U}} \frac{t^i}{i!}\,\mathrm{ad}(x)^i(y) \in J(A_G)\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p). \tag{23}$$

Therefore for large enough p by the Vandermonde determinant we have that $[x, y] \in J(A_G)\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ which shows our claim.

To finish the proof, it is enough to notice that $\mathbb{G}$ is perfect if and only if $\mathbb{H}$ acts without a non-zero fixed vector on $\mathbb{U}/[\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}]$. And so when $\mathbb{G}$ is perfect, for large enough p we have $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{f}_p) \subseteq [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{u}](\mathfrak{f}_p) = [\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p), \mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{f}_p)]$. □

Lemma 21. *Let $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{GL}_n$ be a $\mathbb{Q}_p$-subgroup, and $U := \mathbb{U} \cap \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Then if p is large enough depending only on n, then we have*

$$\pi_{p^2}(U) = \langle g \in \pi_{p^2}(U) |\ g^p \neq 1 \rangle, \text{ and } \ U[p^m] = U^{p^m} := \{u^{p^m} |\ u \in U\},$$

for any positive integer m.

Proof. Let exp and log define $\mathbb{Q}_p$-morphisms between $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{U})$ and $\mathbb{U}$. And so for large enough prime p we have

$$\|\exp x - I\|_p = \|x\|_p, \ \|\log u\|_p = \|u - I\|_p \qquad \text{if } \|x\|_p, \|u\|_p \leq 1. \tag{24}$$

Hence exp and log induce homeomorphisms between $\mathfrak{u} := \mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{U}) \cap \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and U, and moreover for any positive integer m

$$U[p^m] = U^{p^m} := \{u^{p^m} |\ u \in U\}. \tag{25}$$

We have (25) because of the following observation:

$$\begin{aligned} u \in U[p^m] &\Leftrightarrow \|u - I\|_p \leq p^{-m} \Leftrightarrow u = \exp x \text{ and } \|x\|_p \leq p^{-m}, \\ &\Leftrightarrow u = \exp(p^m x') = (\exp x')^{p^m} \text{ and } x' \in \mathfrak{u}, \\ &\Leftrightarrow u \in U^{p^m}. \end{aligned}$$

If $g^p = 1$ for some $g \in \pi_{p^2}(U)$, then for some $u \in U$ we have $g = \pi_{p^2}(u)$ and $u^p \in \ker(\pi_{p^2})$. So there is a (unique) $u' \in U \setminus U^p$ such that $u'^{p^m} = u^p$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 2}$. Another use of the logarithm map, we have $u = u'^{p^{m-1}}$. Hence

$$\pi_{p^2}(U) = \{g^{p^i} |\ g \in \pi_{p^2}(U),\ g^p \neq 1,\ i = 0, 1, 2\}.$$

□

Lemma 22. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a simply-connected semisimple $\mathbb{Q}$-group with a given embedding into $\mathbb{GL}_n$. Let $P_0 = \mathbb{H} \cap \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and $P_1 := \ker(P_0 \xrightarrow{\pi_p} \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}))$. Then for large enough p we have*

$$P_i = \overline{\langle \mathbb{U}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap P_i |\ \mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{H} \text{ unipotent } \mathbb{Q}_p\text{-subgroup} \rangle},$$

for $i = 0, 1$.

Proof. For large enough p, we have that $\mathbb{H}$ is quasi-split over $\mathbb{Q}_p$, and splits over an unramified extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, and P_0 is a hyper-special parahoric subgroup. Let $Q_i = \langle \mathbb{U}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap P_i |\ \mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{H}$ unipotent $\mathbb{Q}_p$-subgroup$\rangle$. Then clearly Q_i is a normal subgroup of P_0. By the Bruhat-Tits theory, there is a smooth $\mathbb{Z}_p$-group scheme $\mathcal{H}$ such that

(1) $P_0 = \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$,
(2) The generic fiber of $\mathcal{H}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{H}$,
(3) The special fiber $\mathcal{H}_p := \mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathfrak{f}_p$ is a simply-connected semisimple $\mathfrak{f}_p$-group since $\mathbb{H}$ is simply connected quasi-split over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and splits over an unramified extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$,
(4) $\pi_p(P_0) = \mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is a product of quasi-simple groups.

Since $\mathbb{H}$ is quasi-split over $\mathbb{Q}_p$, $\pi_p(Q_0)$ intersects any quasi-simple factor subgroup of $\mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ in a non-central subgroup. As $\pi_p(Q_0)$ is a normal subgroup of $\mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)$, $\mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)^+$ is contained in $\pi_p(Q_0)$. As $\mathcal{H}_p$ is simply-connected, we get that $\pi_p(Q_0) = \pi_p(P_0)$. For any positive integer i, let $P_i := \ker(P \xrightarrow{\pi_{p^i}} \mathcal{H}_p(\mathbb{Z}_p/p^i\mathbb{Z}_p))$. It is well-known that P_i/P_{i+1} as an $\mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)$-module is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{H}_p)(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ via the adjoint action. Let's identify $\pi_{p^i}(Q_1 \cap P_{i+1})$ with $\mathfrak{h}_i \subseteq \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{H}_p)(\mathfrak{f}_p)$. Since $Q_1 \lhd P$, $\mathfrak{h}_i$ is $\mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)$-invariant. On the other hand, since $\mathbb{H}$ is quasi-split, $\mathfrak{h}_i$ intersects each one of the Lie algebras of the simple factors of $\mathcal{H}_p$. Since for large enough p the $\mathfrak{f}_p$-points of the Lie algebra of the simple factors of $\mathcal{H}_p$ are simple $\mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)$-module, $\mathfrak{h}_i = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{H}_p)(\mathfrak{f}_p)$. Hence by induction we have $\pi_{p^i}(Q_j) = \pi_{p^i}(P_j)$ for $j = 0, 1$ and any positive integer i, which finishes the proof. □

Lemma 23. *Let $\mathbb{G} \subseteq \mathbb{GL}_n$ be a perfect $\mathbb{Q}$-group. Assume that the semisimple part of $\mathbb{G}$ is simply-connected, i.e. $\mathbb{G} \simeq \mathbb{H} \ltimes \mathbb{U}$ where $\mathbb{H}$ is a simply-connected semisimple $\mathbb{Q}$-group and $\mathbb{U}$ is a unipotent $\mathbb{Q}$-group. Let $P_p = \mathbb{G} \cap \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, $\mathcal{G}$ be the closure of $\mathbb{G}$ in $(\mathcal{GL}_n)_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{G})$. Then*

(1) *For large enough p, the following is a short exact sequence:*

$$1 \to \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p) \to \pi_{p^2}(P_p) \to \pi_p(P_p) \to 1.$$

(2) *For large enough p and any proper subgroup $V \subsetneq \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ which is a normal subgroup of $\pi_{p^2}(P_p)$, the following short exact sequence does not split*

$$1 \to \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)/V \to \pi_{p^2}(P_p)/V \to \pi_p(P_p) \to 1$$

Proof. For large enough p, $Q_p := \mathbb{H} \cap \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is a hyperspecial parahoric subgroup which acts on $U_p := \mathbb{U} \cap \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, and $P_p = Q_p \ltimes U_p$. Furthermore for large enough p, the assumptions of Lemma 22 hold and so $\pi_{p^i}(P_p) = \pi_{p^i}(\langle P_p \cap \mathbb{U}'(\mathbb{Q}_p) |\ \mathbb{U}'$ unipotent $\mathbb{Q}_p$-subgroup$\rangle)$. Hence by Lemma 21 we have

$$\pi_{p^2}(P_p) = \langle g \in \pi_{p^2}(P_p \cap \mathbb{U}'(\mathbb{Q}_p)) |\ \mathbb{U}' \text{ unipotent } \mathbb{Q}_p\text{-subgroup},\ g^p \neq 1\rangle.$$

On the other hand, if for any $\mathbb{Q}_p$-unipotent subgroup $\mathbb{U}'$ of $\mathbb{G}$ we have $\pi_{p^2}(P_p[p] \cap \mathbb{U}'(\mathbb{Q}_p)) \subseteq V$, then by Lemma 22 we get that $\pi_{p^2}(P_p[p]) \subseteq V$ which is a contradiction. Hence for some unipotent $\mathbb{Q}_p$-subgroup $\mathbb{U}'$ there is $x \in \pi_{p^2}(P_p[p] \cap \mathbb{U}'(\mathbb{Q}_p)) \setminus V$. By Lemma 21 there is $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p) \cap \mathbb{U}'(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ such that $\pi_{p^2}(g^p) = x$. Since $\mathbb{U}'$ is a $\mathbb{Q}_p$-subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$ and $P_p = \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}_p) \cap \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, we have that $g \in P_p$, and the order of $\pi_{p^2}(g)$ in $\pi_{p^2}(P_p)/V$ is p^2. Now suppose to the contrary that the given exact sequence splits; then $\pi_{p^2}(P_p)/V \simeq \pi_p(P_p) \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)/V)$, and the latter is a linear group over $\mathfrak{f}_p$. However any p-element of a linear group over $\mathfrak{f}_p$ is unipotent, and so it is of order p (for large enough p), which is a contradiction. □

4.2. **Statistical non-splitting of residue maps.** In this section, following [BV12], we prove that any section of π_p is statistically far from being a group homomorphism.

Lemma 24. *Let $\mathbb{G}$, $\mathfrak{g}$, and P_p be as in Lemma 23. Then there is a positive number δ (depending on $\mathbb{G}$) such that for large enough p (depending on $\mathbb{G}$ and its embedding in $\mathbb{GL}_n$) the following holds: Let $V \subsetneq \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ be a proper subgroup which is normal in $\pi_{p^2}(P_p)$, and $\psi : \pi_p(P_p) \to \pi_{p^2}(P_p)/V$ be a section of the quotient*

map $\pi : \pi_{p^2}(P_p)/V \to \pi_p(P_p)$*, i.e.* $\psi \circ \pi = \mathrm{id}_{\pi_p(P_p)}$*. Let* $\mu = \mathcal{P}_{\pi_p(P_p)}$ *be the probability Haar measure (i.e. the normalized counting measure) on* $\pi_p(P_p)$*. Then*

$$(\mu \times \mu)(\{(x,y) \in \pi_p(P_p) \times \pi_p(P_p) |\ \psi(x)\psi(y) = \psi(xy)\}) < p^{-\delta}.$$

Proof. We notice that by Lemma 20, for large enough p, $V + \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is a proper subspace of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ (which is normal in $\pi_{p^2}(P_p)$). And so without loss of generality we can assume that V contains $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$.

Let $\mathcal{A} := \{(x,y) \in \pi_p(P_p) \times \pi_p(P_p) |\ \psi(x)\psi(y) = \psi(xy)\}$ and suppose that $(\mu \times \mu)(\mathcal{A}) \geq p^{-\delta}$. We will get a contradiction if δ is small enough. Let ν be the push-forward of μ via ψ. For any $g \in \pi_p(P_p)$ we have

$$(\nu * \nu)(\psi(g)) = \sum_{(x,y)\in\mathcal{A},\ xy=g} \mu(x)\mu(y).$$

In particular, we have $(\nu * \nu)(\operatorname{supp}\nu) = (\mu \times \mu)(\mathcal{A})$. And so by Cauchy-Schwartz, we get

$$\sqrt{|\operatorname{supp}\nu|}\|\nu * \nu\|_2 \geq (\nu * \nu)(\operatorname{supp}\nu) = (\mu \times \mu)(\mathcal{A}) \geq p^{-\delta}.$$

Hence $\|\nu * \nu\|_2 \geq p^{-\delta}\|\nu\|_2$. Thus by [Var12, Lemma 15] (which is based on [BG08-a]) there is a symmetric subset $S \subseteq \pi_{p^2}(P_p)/V$ with the following properties:

(1) $|\pi_p(P_p)|^{1-\Theta(\delta)} \leq |S| \leq |\pi_p(P_p)|^{1+\Theta(\delta)}$,
(2) $|\prod_3 S| \leq |\pi_p(P_p)|^{\Theta(\delta)}|S|$,
(3) $\min_{s\in S}(\widetilde{\nu} * \nu)(s) \geq (|\pi_p(P_p)|^{\Theta(\delta)}|S|)^{-1}$.

Since the push-forward $\pi[\nu]$ of ν via π is the probability Haar measure of $\pi_p(P_p)$, we have $\mu = \pi[\widetilde{\nu} * \nu]$. And so the third part of properties of S implies that $\mu(\pi(S)) \geq |\pi_p(P_p)|^{-\Theta(\delta)}$. Therefore $|\pi(S)| \geq |\pi_p(P_p)|^{1-\Theta(\delta)}$. On the other hand, by [SGV12, Corollary 14] and [LS74], we have that $\pi_p(P_p)$ is a quasi-random group, i.e. the minimal degree of its non-trivial irreducible representations is at least $|\pi_p(P_p)|^{\Theta_{\mathbb{G}}(1)}$ for large enough p. Thus by Gowers's result [Gow08] (we use the formulation in [NP11, Corollary 1]) we have that $\pi(\prod_3 S) = \pi_p(P_p)$ if δ is small enough. So $S' = \prod_3 S$ has the following properties:

(1) $\pi(S') = \pi_p(P_p)$,
(2) S' is a $|\pi_p(P_p)|^{\Theta(\delta)}$-approximate subgroup by [Tao08],
(3) $|S'| \leq |\pi_p(P_P)|^{1+\Theta(\delta)}$ by the Ruzsa inequality (see [Hel05]).

Next we prove that there is $0 \neq x \in \prod_3 S' \cap (\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)/V)$. We proceed by contradiction. For any $s_1, s_2 \in S'$, there is $s_3 \in S'$ such that $\pi(s_1 s_2) = \pi(s_3)$. Hence $s_1 s_2 s_3^{-1} \in \prod_3 S' \cap (\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)/V)$, and so by the contrary assumption we have $s_1 s_2 = s_3$. Thus S' is a subgroup which contradicts Lemma 23.

Since V contains $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$, $\pi(S) = \pi_p(P_p)$ acts on $(\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)/V)$ via the adjoint action without non-zero fixed point for large enough p. Hence by [SGV12, Lemma 30], $\sum_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} \pi(S') \cdot x$ contains a non-zero subspace of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)/V$. Therefore $|\prod_{O(1)} S' \cap (\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)/V)| \geq p$, and we get $|\prod_{O(1)} S'| \geq p|\pi_p(P_p)|$. Since S' is an approximate subgroup, we get

$$p|\pi_p(P_p)| \leq |\prod_{O(1)} S'| \leq |\pi_p(P_p)|^{1+\Theta(\delta)}.$$

So $p \leq |\pi_p(P_p)|^{\Theta(\delta)}$ which is a contradiction for small enough δ. □

4.3. **Bounded generation of perfect groups by commutators.**

Lemma 25. *Let* P *be a finite* p*-group. Suppose* $|P| = p^n$ *and* $|P/[P,P]| = p^m$*. Then*

$$\prod_{n-m}\{[g_1, g_2] |\ g_1, g_2 \in P\} = [P,P].$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on the nilpotency class of P. If P is abelian, there is nothing to prove. Now suppose the nilpotency class of P is c, i.e. its $c+1$-th lower central series $\gamma_{c+1}(P)$ is trivial and $\gamma_c(P)$ is not

trivial. It is well-known that $\gamma_c(P)$ is an $\mathfrak{f}_p$-vector space which is spanned by long commutators. So $\gamma_c(P)$ is contained in $\prod_{\dim_{\mathfrak{f}_p}\gamma_c(P)}\{[g_1,g_2]|\ g_1,g_2\in P\}$. By induction hypothesis, we have

$$\prod_{n-m-\dim_{\mathfrak{f}_p}\gamma_c(P)}\{[\bar{g}_1,\bar{g}_2]|\ \bar{g}_1,\bar{g}_2\in P/\gamma_c(P)\}=P/\gamma_c(P).$$

And so $\prod_{n-m}\{[g_1,g_2]|\ g_1,g_2\in P\}=P$. □

Lemma 26. *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a Zariski-connected perfect $\mathbb{Q}$-subgroup of $(\mathbb{GL}_n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be its Zariski-closure in $(\mathcal{GL}_n)_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Suppose that $\mathbb{G}$ is simply-connected, i.e. its semisimple part is simply-connected. Then there is a positive integer C depending on $\mathbb{G}$ such that for large enough prime p we have*

$$\prod_C\{[g_1,g_2]|\ g_1,g_2\in\mathcal{G}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)\}=\mathcal{G}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p),$$

where $\mathcal{G}_p=\mathcal{G}\times_{\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{Z}}\operatorname{Spec}\mathfrak{f}_p$.

Proof. As it was mentioned earlier, for large enough p, $\mathcal{G}_p\simeq\mathcal{H}_p\ltimes\mathcal{U}_p$ is a perfect $\mathfrak{f}_p$-group, where $\mathcal{H}_p$ is a simply connected semisimple $\mathfrak{f}_p$-group and $\mathcal{U}_p$ is a unipotent $\mathfrak{f}_p$-group. Moreover $\mathcal{G}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)=\mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)\ltimes\mathcal{U}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)$, and $V_p:=\mathcal{U}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)/[\mathcal{U}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p),\mathcal{U}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)]$ is a completely reducible $\mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)$-module with no non-zero fixed vector. Let $w(x_1,x_2)=[x_1,x_2]$ and, for any group K, let $w(K):=\{w(k_1,k_2)|\ k_1,k_2\in K\}$. Then by [Sha09] or [NP11] we have that $\prod_3 w(\mathcal{H}_p)=\mathcal{H}_p$ for large enough p.

Let $H_p=\mathcal{H}_p(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ and $G_p=H_p\ltimes V_p$. Let $\rho:H_p\to\mathrm{GL}(V_p)$ be the homomorphism induced from the action of H_p on V_p. Then $\prod_7 w(G_p)$ contains

$$\{\rho(h)((\rho(h')-I)(v))|\ h,h'\in H_p,\ v\in V_p\}.$$

And so $\prod_{7\dim_{\mathfrak{f}_p}V_p}w(G_p)$ contains the $\mathfrak{f}_p[H_p]$-submodule M_p of V_p generated by $\{(\rho(h)-I)(v)|\ h\in H_p,\ v\in V_p\}$. Therefore H_p acts trivially on V_p/M_p. Since V_p is a completely reducible H_p-module with no non-zero fixed vectors, $M_p=V_p$. Thus

$$\prod_{O(\dim\mathbb{G})}w(G_p)=G_p.$$

And so by Lemma 25 we are done. □

Lemma 27. *Let $\mathbb{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be as in Lemma 26, and N be a positive integer. Suppose the unipotent radical of $\mathbb{G}$ is abelian. Then there is a positive integer C depending on $\mathcal{G}$ and N such that for large enough p we have*

$$\prod_C\{[g_1,g_2]|\ g_i\in\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}/p^N\mathbb{Z})\}=\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}/p^N\mathbb{Z}).$$

Proof. By Lemma 26 we get the case of $N=1$. It is well-known that π_p induces the following short exact sequence.

$$1\to\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)\to\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})\xrightarrow{\pi_p}\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{f}_p)\to 1,$$

where $\mathfrak{g}=\mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{G})$, and the conjugation action of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})$ on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ factors through the adjoint action of $\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$. Let $\mathfrak{u}$ be the Lie algebra of the Zariski-closure of the unipotent radical of $\mathbb{G}$ in $\mathcal{G}$. For large enough p, $\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ and $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ are perfect, and $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is a completely reducible $\mathcal{G}(f_p)$-module without any non-zero invariant vectors (as $\mathbb{U}$ is abelian). So by a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 26, we have

$$\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)}w(\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}))\supseteq\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p),$$

and so by Lemma 26, we have that

$$\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)}w(\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}))=\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}).$$

Now using the facts that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)[p^i]/\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)[p^{i+1}]\simeq\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$, the group commutators are mapped to the Lie algebra commutators, and $\mathfrak{g}(f_p)$ is perfect, we get the desired result. (See [SG-b, Lemma 29] for the relations between the group commutators and the Lie algebra commutators.) □

4.4. **Proof of Theorem 17 for bounded powers of square-free integers.** Now we go to the proof of Theorem 1 for $\mathcal{C}_N$. Having the above lemmas the rest of the proof is a modification of the proof of [BV12, Section 3].

By Section 3.2, it is enough to prove Theorem 17 for $\mathcal{C}_N$. So for a given $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ we would like to show that for small enough δ and large enough C, if $Q \in \mathcal{C}_N$ and $\mathcal{P}^{(l)}(A) > Q^{-\delta}$ for some integer $l > \log Q/\delta$, then $\pi_Q(\Gamma[q]) \subseteq \prod_C \pi_Q(A)$ for some $q|Q$ such that $q < Q^{\varepsilon}$.

First we notice that by a similar argument as in (13) we have

$$|\pi_Q(A)| > Q^{\Theta_\Omega(1)},$$

for small enough δ. Hence

$$|(\pi_Q(\prod_{\Theta_\Omega(1)} A) \cdot (\pi_Q(\prod_{\Theta_\Omega(1)} A)| \leq |(\pi_Q(\prod_{\Theta_\Omega(1)} A)|^{1+\delta}$$

for a suitable implied constant. Therefore $\mathfrak{P}_Q(\delta, \prod_{\Theta_\Omega(1)} A, l)$ holds.

Since $\ker(\rho_1) \cap \Gamma = \{1\}$, we have $\mathcal{P}^{(l)}_{\rho_1(\Omega)}(\rho_1(A)) > Q^{-\delta}$. Thus by a similar argument and using Rusza inequality we have that $\mathfrak{P}_Q(C\delta, \rho_1(\prod_C A), Cl)$ and $\mathfrak{P}_Q(C\delta, \prod_C A, Cl)$ hold for some positive integer $C = \Theta_\Omega(1)$. So without loss of generality we can and will assume that $\mathfrak{P}_Q(\delta, A, l)$ and $\mathfrak{P}_Q(\delta, \rho_1(A), l)$ hold.

Since the power of the prime factors of Q are bounded by N, by [SG-b, Corollary 13], without loss of generality we can and will assume that all the prime factors are large enough. In particular, we can assume that the assertions of all the above Lemmas hold for any prime factor p of Q. Let $Q_s := \prod_{p|Q} p$ (, and so $Q|Q_s^N$). By [SGV12, Theorem 1], [SG-b, Lemma 26], and $l > \frac{N}{\delta} \log Q_s$ we have that

$$\left| \pi_{Q_s}[\mathcal{P}]^{(l)}(\pi_{Q_s}(A)) - \frac{|\pi_{Q_s}(A)|}{|\pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma)|} \right| \leq \frac{1}{|\pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma)|}$$

for small enough δ. And so we have

$$Q_s{}^{-N\delta} \leq Q^{-\delta} \leq \pi_{Q_s}[\mathcal{P}]^{(l)}(\pi_{Q_s}(A)) \leq \frac{|\pi_{Q_s}(A)| + 1}{|\pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma)|},$$

which implies that $|\pi_{Q_s}(A)| \geq |\pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma)| Q_s^{-\Theta_{\Omega,N}(\delta)}$. Since we assumed that the prime factors of Q are large enough, we have that $\pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma) \simeq \prod_{p|Q} \pi_p(\Gamma)$. Writing $Q_s = \prod_{j=1}^{l} p_j$, to the product set $\prod_{i=1}^{l} \pi_{p_i}(\Gamma)$ one can associate a rooted tree with l levels. The root is considered to be the zero level. The vertices of the j-th level are elements of $\prod_{i=1}^{j} \pi_{p_i}(\Gamma)$, and each vertex is connected to its projection in the previous level. By a regularity argument similar to the proof of [SG-b, Lemma 10] (see [BGS10, Lemma 5.2] or [Var12, Page 26]), one can show that there are a set $A' \subseteq A$ and a sequence of integers $\{k_i\}_{i=1}^{l}$ such that for any $g \in A'$ and for any $1 \leq i \leq l$ we have

$$|\{x \in \pi_{p_i}(\Gamma)| \ \exists h \in A' : \ \pi_{p_1 \cdots p_{i-1}}(h) = \pi_{p_1 \cdots p_{i-1}}(g) \text{ and } \pi_{p_i}(h) = x\}| = k_i,$$

and

$$|A'| = \prod_{i=1}^{l} k_i \geq (\prod_{i=1}^{l} 2 \log |\pi_{p_i}(\Gamma)|)^{-1} |A|.$$

As we mentioned earlier, by [SGV12, Corollary 14] and [LS74], $\pi_p(\Gamma)$ is a quasi-random group for large enough p. So by a result of Gowers [Gow08] (see [NP11]) there is a positive number c_0 depending on $\mathbb{G}$ such that for large enough p the following holds: if $A, B, C \subseteq \pi_p(\Gamma)$ and $|A|, |B|, |C| \geq |\pi_p(\Gamma)|^{1-c_0}$, then $A \cdot B \cdot C = G$. We assume that the prime factors of Q are large enough so that $2 \log |\pi_{p_i}(\Gamma)| < |\pi_{p_i}(\Gamma)|^{c_0 \varepsilon}$. Hence

$$\prod_{i=1}^{l} k_i \geq |\pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma)|^{1-\Theta(\delta)-c_0\varepsilon}.$$

Let $I := \{i|\ k_i < |\pi_{p_i}(\Gamma)|^{1-c_0}\}$; then we have

$$|\pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma)|/\prod_{i\in I}|\pi_{p_i}(\Gamma)|^{c_0} \geq \prod_{i=1}^{l} k_i \geq |\pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma)|^{1-\Theta(\delta)-c_0\varepsilon},$$

and so

$$\prod_{i\in I} p_i \leq Q_s^{\Theta(\delta)+2\varepsilon} \leq Q_s^{4\varepsilon},$$

for small enough δ (depending on Ω, N and ε). Now by a similar argument as in [Var12, Page 26] (using the mentioned result of Gowers) one can show that

$$\pi_{\prod_{i\notin I} p_i}(A\cdot A\cdot A) = \pi_{\prod_{i\notin I} p_i}(\Gamma). \tag{26}$$

Let $Q'_s = \prod_{i\notin I} p_i$ and $q' = Q_s/Q'_s$. By (26) there is a function $f_1 : \pi_{Q'_s}(\Gamma) \to \pi_{q'^N}(\Gamma)$ such that $\{(g, f_1(g))|\ g \in \pi_{Q'_s}(\Gamma)\}$ is contained in $\pi_{Q'_s q'^N}(\prod_3 A)$. Thus there is a fiber of f_1 with at least $Q_s^{1-\Theta_{\mathbb{G},N}(\varepsilon)}$-many elements. Hence, as before by a regularization argument and another application of the mentioned Gower's result (for $\varepsilon \ll_{\mathbb{G},N} 1$), there is $q''|Q'_s$ and a function $f_2 : \pi_{Q'_s/q''}(\Gamma) \to \pi_{q''}(\Gamma)$ such that $q'' \leq Q^{\Theta_{\mathbb{G},N}(\varepsilon)}$ and

$$\{(g, f_2(g), 1) \in \pi_{Q'_s/q''}(\Gamma)\times\pi_{q''}(\Gamma)\times\pi_{q'^N}(\Gamma)|g \in \pi_{Q'_s/q''}(\Gamma)\}$$

is contained in $\pi_{Q'_s q'^N}(\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} A)$. Hence, for any $g_1, g_2 \in \pi_{Q'_s/q''}(\Gamma)$, we have

$$([g_1, g_2], 1, 1) = [(g_1, f_2(g_1), 1), (g_2, 1, f_1(g_2, 1))] \in \pi_{Q'_s q'^N}(\textstyle\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} A).$$

Therefore by Lemma 26

$$\pi_{Q'_s q'^N}(\Gamma[q'^N]) \subseteq \pi_{Q'_s q'^N}(\textstyle\prod_{Q_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} A).$$

Let A' be a subset of $\prod_{Q_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} A$ such that $\pi_{Q'_s q'^N}(\Gamma[q'^N]) = \pi_{Q'_s q'^N}(A')$. Now we will go to the second level, i.e. we will show that there are a positive integer C and $\bar{q}|Q'_s$ such that $\bar{q} \leq Q^{\Theta(\varepsilon)}$ and $\pi_{Q'^2_s}(\prod_C A')$ contains $\pi_{Q'^2_s}(\Gamma[\bar{q}^2])$.

Lemma 28. *In the above setting, assume $\mathbb{U}$ is abelian. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $\delta > 0$ and a positive integer C such that the following holds.*

Assume $A \subseteq \Gamma$ and a square-free integer Q_s have the following properties:

1. *$Q_s^{\varepsilon} \gg_{\Omega} 1$.*
2. *The prime factors of Q_s are sufficiently large (depending on Ω); in particular the assertions of Lemma 23 hold, and $\pi_{Q_s^2}(\Gamma) \simeq \prod_{p|Q_s} \pi_{p^2}(\Gamma)$.*
3. *$\pi_{Q_s}(A) = \pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma)$.*
4. *For any prime factor p of Q_s, let $V_p \subsetneq \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ be a $\pi_p(\Gamma)$-invariant under the adjoint action. And $\prod_{p|Q_s} V_p \subseteq \pi_{Q_s^2}(A)$.*

Then there are Q'_s and $\{M_p\}_{p|Q'_s}$ such that

1. *$Q'_s|Q_s$ and $Q_s^{1-\varepsilon} \leq Q'_s$.*
2. *For any p, we have $V_p \subsetneq M_p \subseteq \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$, and M_p is $\pi_p(\Gamma)$-invariant under the adjoint action.*
3. *$\prod_{p|Q'_s} M_p \oplus \prod_{p|(Q_s/Q'_s)}\{0\} \subseteq \pi_{Q_s^2}(\prod_C A)$.*

Proof. Since $V_p \subseteq \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$, the map $\pi_p : \pi_{p^2}(\Gamma) \to \pi_p(\Gamma)$ factors through $\pi_{p^2}(\Gamma)/V_p$. Let us abuse the notation and still denote the induce homomorphism by $\pi_p : \pi_{p^2}(\Gamma)/V_p \to \pi_p(\Gamma)$. Let $\psi : \pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma) \to A \subseteq \Gamma$ be a section of π_{Q_s}, and $\psi_p : \pi_{Q_s}(\Gamma) \to \pi_{p^2}(\Gamma)/V_p$ be $\psi_p(g) = \pi_{p^2}(\psi(g))V_p$. As in [BV12], let us consider the following

expectation with respect to the Haar measure:

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{p|Q_s,\ \psi_p(xy)=\psi_p(x)\psi_p(y)} \log p\right) = \sum_{p|Q_s} \log p \cdot (\mathcal{P}_{\pi_p(\Gamma)} \times \mathcal{P}_{\pi_p(\Gamma)})(\{(x,y)|\ \psi_p(xy)=\psi_p(x)\psi_p(y)\})$$
$$\leq \sum_{p|Q_s} p^{-\Theta_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} \log p \leq \log(Q_s^{\varepsilon}),$$

where the first inequality is given by Lemma 24 and the second inequality holds for $Q_s^{\varepsilon} \gg_{\mathbb{G}} 1$. So there is $Q'_s|Q_s$ such that $Q'_s \geq Q_s^{1-\varepsilon}$ and for any prime factor p of Q'_s there are $x, y \in \pi_p(\Gamma)$ such that $z_p := \psi_p(x)\psi_p(y)\psi_p(xy)^{-1} \neq 1$. Hence for any $p|Q'_s$ there is $a \in \prod_3 A$ such that $\pi_{p^2}(a)$ belongs to $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p) \setminus V_p$ where $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is identified with $\pi_{p^2}(\Gamma[p])$. By our assumptions on $\mathbb{G}$, $\pi_p(\Gamma)$ is generated by its p-elements and $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is a completely reducible $\pi_p(\Gamma)$-module with no non-zero invariant vector (the latter holds as $\mathbb{G}$ is perfect and its unipotent radical is abelian). Therefore by [SGV12, Corollary 31] $\sum_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} \pi_p(\Gamma) \cdot z_p$ is the $\pi_p(\Gamma)$-subspace N_p of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ that is generated by z_p. This implies that $\pi_{Q'^2_s}(\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} A)$ contains

$$\textstyle\sum_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} \pi_{Q'_s}(A) \cdot (z_p)_{p|Q'_s} = \prod_{p|Q'_s} \sum_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} \pi_p(\Gamma) \cdot z_p = \prod_{p|Q'_s} N_p.$$

And so $\pi_{Q'^2_s}(\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} A)$ contains $\prod_{p|Q'_s}(N_p + V_p)$, which finishes the proof. □

By Equation (26) and repeated use of Lemma 28 ($O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)$-many times), we get that there is $q|Q_s$ such that $q \leq Q_s^{\Theta_{\mathbb{G}}(\varepsilon)}$ (if $Q_s^{\varepsilon} \gg_{\mathbb{G}} 1$) and $\pi_{Q_s{}^2}(\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G}}(1)} A) \supseteq \pi_{Q_s{}^2}(\Gamma[q^2]) = \prod_{p|(Q_s/q)} \pi_{p^2}(\Gamma) \times \prod_{p|q}\{1\}$. Now again using the connection between the group commutator and the Lie algebra commutator via the *finite logarithmic maps* (See [SG-b, Section 2.9]) and the fact that we can assume $\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{f}_p)$ is perfect for any $p|Q_s$, we have

$$\pi_{Q_s{}^N}(\textstyle\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G},N}(1)} A) = \pi_{(Q_s/q)^N}(\Gamma) = \prod_{p|(Q_s/q)} \pi_{p^N}(\Gamma). \tag{27}$$

Hence there is a function $f_1 : \pi_{(Q_s/q)^N}(\Gamma) \to \pi_{q^N}(\Gamma[q])$ such that $G(f_1) := \{(g, f_1(g))|g \in \pi_{(Q_s/q)^N}(\Gamma)\}$ is contained in $\pi_{Q_s^N}(\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G},N}(1)} A)$. Let $w(x_1,x_2) := x_1^{-1}x_2^{-1}x_1x_2$ and for any subset X of a group $w(X) := \{w(x_1,x_2)|\ x_1,x_2 \in X\}$. Then $w(G(f_1)) \subseteq \pi_{(Q_s/q)^N}(\Gamma) \times \pi_{q^N}(\Gamma[q^2])$. And so by Lemma 27 we have that there is a function $f_2 : \pi_{(Q_s/q)^N}(\Gamma) \to \pi_{q^N}(\Gamma[q^2])$ such that its graph $G(f_2)$ is contained in $\pi_{Q_s^N}(\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G},N}(1)} A)$. Repeating this argument $\log N$ times we get that $\pi_{Q_s^N}(\Gamma[q^N])$ is contained in $\pi_{Q_s^N}(\prod_{O_{\mathbb{G},N}(1)} A)$, which finishes the proof of Theorem 17 for $\mathcal{C}_N$.

5. Super-approximation: the p-adic case.

To prove Theorem 1 for $\mathcal{C} := \{p^m|\ p \in V_f(\mathbb{Q}), p \nmid q_0, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$, by Section 3.2, it is enough to Prove Theorem 17 for $\mathcal{C}$.

In this section, we work in the setting of Section 2.5. In addition, we assume that $\mathbb{U}$ is abelian. So we assume that $\mathbb{V}$ is a vector $\mathbb{Q}$-group, $\mathbb{G}_s$ is a connected, simply-connected, semisimple $\mathbb{Q}$-group, there is a $\mathbb{Q}$-homomorphism $\mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{GL}(\mathbb{V})$ with no non-zero fixed vector, and $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{G}_s \ltimes \mathbb{V}$ is the Zariski-closure of $\Gamma = \langle\Omega\rangle$. We also fix a $\mathbb{Q}$-embedding $\mathbb{G} \subseteq \mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$.

Suppose $A \subseteq \Gamma$ such that $\mathcal{P}^{(l)}(A) > Q^{-\delta}$ for some integer $l > \log Q/\delta$. By a similar argument as in the beginning of Section 4.4, replacing A with $\prod_C A$, δ with $C\delta$, and l with Cl for some $C = \Theta_{\mathbb{G}}(1)$, we can and will assume that $\mathfrak{P}_Q(\delta, A, l)$ and $\mathfrak{P}_Q(\delta, \rho_1(A), l)$ hold.

It is worth pointing out that Theorem 17 for semisimple groups is proved in [SG-b, Theorem 31].

5.1. Escape from proper subgroups.

In this section, we explore the pro-p structure of an open subgroup of the p-adic closure Γ_p of Γ. The main goal is to escape proper subgroups of $\pi_Q(\Gamma)$ where $Q = p^n$ is a power of a prime p.

Proposition 29. *In the above setting, there is a positive number δ (depending on Ω) such that for any $n \gg_\Omega 1$ and any proper subgroup H of $\pi_{p^n}(\Gamma)$ we have*

$$\mathcal{P}^{(l)}_{\pi_{p^n}(\Omega)}(H) \leq [\pi_{p^n}(\Gamma) : H]^{-\delta},$$

for $l \geq \frac{n}{\delta}\log p$.

We start with a (well-known) lemma which gives us the Frattini subgroup of the congruence subgroups of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, where (as before) $\mathcal{G}$ is the closure of $\mathbb{G}$ in $(\mathcal{GL}_{N_0})_{\mathbb{Z}_S}$. This kind of result for semisimple groups and large p goes back to Weisfeiler [Wei84].

Lemma 30. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be as above, and $G := \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Suppose either $p \gg_{\mathcal{G}} 1$ or $m_0 \gg_{\mathcal{G}} 1$. If $\widetilde{H}$ is a closed subgroup of $G[p^{m_0}]$ and $\widetilde{H}G[p^{m_0+1}] = G[p^{m_0}]$, then $\widetilde{H} = G[p^{m_0}]$. And so the Frattini subgroup $\Phi(G[p^{m_0}]) = G[p^{m_0+1}]$.*

Proof. By induction on k we prove that $\widetilde{H}G[p^{m_0+k}] = G[p^{m_0}]$. The base of the induction is given by the assumption. To get the induction step, it is enough to prove that $(\widetilde{H} \cap G[p^{m_0+k}])G[p^{m_0+k+1}] = G[p^{m_0+k}]$. By [SG-b, Lemma 29], we have $\Psi^{p^{m_0+1}}_{p^{m_0}} : G[p^{m_0}]/G[p^{m_0+1}] \to \mathfrak{g}/p\mathfrak{g}$ is an isomorphism if either $p \gg_{\mathcal{G}} 1$ or $m_0 \gg_{\mathcal{G}} 1$ (see [SG-b, Section 2.9] for the definition and properties of *finite logarithmic map* $\Psi^{p^{m_0+1}}_{p^{m_0}}$). And so by the assumption, for any $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ there is $h \in \widetilde{H}$ such that $\pi_{p^{m_0+1}}(h) = \pi_{p^{m_0+1}}(I + p^{m_0}x)$. On the other hand, if $m_0 \geq 2$, then $\pi_p(((I + p^{m_0}x')^p - I)/p^{m_0+1}) = \pi_p(x')$. And so $\Psi^{p^{m_0+k+1}}_{p^{m_0+k}}(\pi_{p^{m_0+k+1}}(h^{p^k})) = \pi_p(x)$. Since, by [SG-b, Lemma 29], $\Psi^{p^{m_0+k+1}}_{p^{m_0+k}} : G[p^{m_0+k}]/G[p^{m_0+k+1}] \to \mathfrak{g}/p\mathfrak{g}$ is a bijection, we get the induction step. Since $\widetilde{H}$ is a closed subgroup, we have that $\widetilde{H} = G[p^{m_0}]$. □

The following lemma which is a module theoretic version of [SG05, Lemma 3.5] is proved next. It will be needed in the following sections, too.

Lemma 31. *Let $R \subseteq M_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_p$-subalgebra. Suppose $\mathbb{Q}_p^{n_0}$ is a simple $\mathbb{Q}_p[R]$-module, where $\mathbb{Q}_p[R]$ is the $\mathbb{Q}_p$-span of R. Then*

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0} \setminus p\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}} [\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0} : Rv] < \infty.$$

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that there is a sequence of unit vectors v_i such that $[\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0} : Rv_i]$ goes to infinity as i goes to infinity. Since the set of unit vectors is a compact set, by passing to a subsequence we can assume that $\lim_{i\to\infty} v_i = v$ where v is a unit vector. Since $\mathbb{Q}_p^{n_0}$ is a simple $\mathbb{Q}_p[R]$-module, the $\mathbb{Q}_p$-span of Rv is $\mathbb{Q}_p^{n_0}$. And so Rv is of finite-index in $\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}$. Therefore Rv contains $p^{k_0}\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}$ for some positive integer k_0. If i is large enough, $v - v_i \in p^{k_0+1}\mathbb{Z}_p$. So $Rv_i + p^{k_0+1}\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0} = Rv + p^{k_0+1}\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0} \supseteq p^{k_0}\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}$. Since Rv_i is complete and the Frattini subgroup of $p^{k_0}\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}$ is $p^{k_0+1}\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}$, $Rv_i \supseteq p^{k_0}\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}$ which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 32. *Let $\mathbb{G}_s \subseteq \mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$ be as before, i.e. a semisimple group. Let $G := \mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)[p^{k_0}]$ for a fixed positive integer k_0. Suppose m is large enough depending on the embedding of $\mathbb{G}_s$ in $\mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$ and k_0. Then the following holds:*

Suppose W_s is a subspace of $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_s)(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ such that $\pi_{p^m}(W_s \cap \mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))$ is invariant under G. Then W_s is $\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-invariant.

Proof. We know that $\mathbb{G}_s$ is the (almost) product of almost $\mathbb{Q}_p$-simple factors $\mathbb{G}_i$. Now, if $(x_1, \ldots, x_{r_0}) \in \bigoplus_i(\mathrm{Lie}\,\mathbb{G}_i(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))$ is in W_s, then for any $g_i \in \mathbb{G}_i(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)[p^{k_0}]$ we have

$$(x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{Ad}(g_i)(x_i), \ldots, x_{r_0}) \in (W_s \cap \mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)) + p^m\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p).$$

By Lemma 31 we have

$$\mathbb{Z}_p[\mathrm{Ad}(\mathbb{G}_i(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)[p^{k_0}])]x_i \supseteq p^{O(1)}\|x_i\|_p \left(\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_i)(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)\right),$$

where the implied constant depends on the embedding of $\mathbb{G}_s$ and k_0. Hence for some i_j's we have

$$\pi_{p^m}\left(\bigoplus_j p^{O(1)}(\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_{i_j})(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))\right)\subseteq\pi_{p^m}\left(W_s\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)\right)\subseteq\pi_{p^m}\left(\bigoplus_j(\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_{i_j})(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))\right).$$

So for large enough m (depending on the embedding of $\mathbb{G}_s$ and k_0) we have $W_s=\bigoplus_j\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_{i_j})(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, which implies that W_s is $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-invariant. □

Lemma 33. *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be as before, i.e. $\mathbb{G}=\mathbb{G}_s\ltimes\mathbb{V}\subseteq\mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$. Let $G:=\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)[p^{k_0}]$ for a fixed positive integer k_0. Suppose m is large enough depending on the embedding of $\mathbb{G}$ in $\mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$ and k_0. Then the following holds:*

Suppose W is a subspace of $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G})(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ such that the projection of W onto $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_s)(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is onto and $\pi_{p^m}(W\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))$ is invariant under G. Then $W=\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G})(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can and will assume that $\mathbb{V}$ is non-zero. Let us recall that $\mathbb{G}_s$ acts on $\mathbb{V}$ via $\rho:\mathbb{G}_s\to\mathrm{GL}(\mathbb{V})$. To get a clear computation of the adjoint action, we identify $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G})(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ with

$$\ker(\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p[\varepsilon])\ltimes\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p[\varepsilon])\xrightarrow{\pi_\varepsilon}\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)\ltimes\mathbb{V}_p(\mathbb{Q}_p))$$

where $\varepsilon^2=0$. For any $v\in\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and any $(1+\varepsilon x,\varepsilon w)\in\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G})(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ad}(v)(x,w)&=\mathrm{Ad}(1,v)(x,w)=(1,v)(1+\varepsilon x,\varepsilon w)(1,-v)\\&=(1+\varepsilon x,\rho(1+\varepsilon x)(v)-v+\varepsilon w)=(1+\varepsilon x,\varepsilon(d\rho(x)(v)+w))=(x,d\rho(x)(v)+w).\end{aligned}$$

Notice that we are slightly abusing the notation and use the addition for the group operation of $\mathbb{V}$ though it is realized as a subgroup of $\mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$. By this computation, for any $(x,w)\in W$ and $v\in\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, we have

$$p^{k_0}d\rho(x)(v):=(0,p^{k_0}d\rho(x)(v))=\mathrm{Ad}(p^{k_0}v)(x,w)-(x,w)\in(W\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))+p^m\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p).$$

Thus we have

$$p^{k_0}d\rho(\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_s)(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))(\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))\subseteq(W\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))+p^m\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p).$$

Since $\mathbb{V}$ is a completely reducible $\mathbb{G}_s$ module with no trivial factors, we have

$$d\rho(\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_s)(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))(\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))\supseteq p^{O(1)}(\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)),$$

where the implied constant depends on $\mathbb{G}$ and its embedding into $\mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$. Therefore $\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)\subseteq W$ which implies the claim. □

Lemma 34. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be as before. Suppose either $p\gg_{\mathcal{G}}1$ or $m_0\gg_{\mathcal{G}}1$. Let $G:=\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Then there is a positive number δ such that for any prime $p\notin S$ and an open subgroup $\widetilde{H}$ of $G[p^{m_0}]$ the set*

$$\mathcal{L}_\delta(\widetilde{H}):=\{\lambda\in\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_S)\cap\widetilde{H}\mid\|\lambda\|_S\leq[\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p):\widetilde{H}]^\delta\}$$

is in a proper Zariski-closed subgroup of $\mathbb{G}$.

Proof. Since $\mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_S)$ is a discrete set with respect to the S-norm, we can and will assume that $[\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p):\widetilde{H}]$ is large enough. Otherwise choosing δ small enough, we have that $\mathcal{L}_\delta(\widetilde{H})$ is a subset of a finite subgroup and we are done.

Suppose p or m_0 are large enough so that Lemma 30 holds. Let $G:=\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and

$$l(\widetilde{H}):=\min\{k\in\mathbb{Z}^+\mid\widetilde{H}\supseteq G[p^k]\}.$$

Notice that, since $\widetilde{H}$ is an open subgroup, $l(\widetilde{H})$ is finite. By Lemma 30, for any $m_0\leq k\leq l(\widetilde{H})-1$, we have that $(\widetilde{H}\cap G[p^k])G[p^{k+1}]/G[p^{k+1}]$ is a proper $\mathfrak{f}_p$-subspace of $G[p^k]/G[p^{k+1}]\simeq\mathfrak{g}/p\mathfrak{g}$. Thus we have

$$p^{l(\widetilde{H})-m_0}\leq[G[p^{m_0}]:\widetilde{H}]\leq p^{d(l(\widetilde{H})-m_0)},\tag{28}$$

where $d = \dim_{\mathfrak{f}_p} \mathfrak{g}/p\mathfrak{g}$. Now let

$$\overline{V}_{\widetilde{H}} := \Psi^{p^l}_{p^{l'}}((\widetilde{H} \cap G[p^{l'}])G[p^l]/G[p^l]) \subseteq \mathfrak{g}/p^{l-l'}\mathfrak{g},$$

where $l := l(\widetilde{H})$ and $l' := \lceil l/2 \rceil + m_0$. So there are a $\mathbb{Z}_p$-basis $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_d\}$ of $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and positive integers $n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_{d'}$ such that $\overline{V}_{\widetilde{H}} = \pi_{p^{l-l'}}(\sum_{i=1}^{d'} p^{n_i}\mathbb{Z}_p\mathbf{e}_i)$ (for some $d' \leq d$). Since

$$0 = n_0 \leq n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_{d'} \leq \lfloor l/2 \rfloor - m_0 =: n_{d'+1},$$

there is i_0 such that $n_{i_0} - n_{i_0-1} = \Theta_{\mathcal{G}}(l)$. Let $W_{\widetilde{H}} := \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} p^{n_i}\mathbb{Z}_p\mathbf{e}_i \subset \underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ (if $i_0 = 1$, then $W_{\widetilde{H}} = 0$). So $\pi_{p^{n_{i_0}}}(W_{\widetilde{H}})$ is $\widetilde{H}$-invariant under the adjoint action.

On the other hand, it is well-known (for instance by reduction theory) that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_S)$ is a finitely generated group. We fix a finite generating set Ω' of $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Z}_S)$.

Claim 1. There are $c(\mathcal{G}) < 1 < C(\mathcal{G})$ such that for some $w \in \underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and $l \in \underline{\mathfrak{g}}^*(\mathbb{Z}_p) := \hom_{\mathbb{Z}_p}(\underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p), \mathbb{Z}_p)$ the following holds

(1) for any $h \in \widetilde{H}$, $|l(\mathrm{Ad}(h)(w))|_p \leq [\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p) : \widetilde{H}]^{-c}$;
(2) for some $\gamma \in \Omega'$, $|l(\mathrm{Ad}(\gamma)(w))|_p \geq [\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p) : \widetilde{H}]^{-c/C}$.

Proof of Claim 1. To prove the claim we consider three cases:

Case 1. $\underline{W_{\widetilde{H}}}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ projects onto $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.

Since $\underline{W_{\widetilde{H}}}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is a proper subspace, by Lemma 33 and strong approximation we have that $\pi_{p^{O_{\mathcal{G}}(1)}}(\underline{W_{\widetilde{H}}}(\mathbb{Z}_p))$ is not $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_S)$-invariant. Hence for some $\gamma \in \Omega'$, $i \leq i_0 - 1$, and $j \geq i_0$ we have

$$|\mathbf{e}_j^*(\mathrm{Ad}(\gamma')(\mathbf{e}_i))|_p > 1/p^{\Theta_{\mathcal{G}}(1)}, \tag{29}$$

where $\mathbf{e}_j^*$ is the dual basis of $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_d\}$.

Since $\overline{V}_{\widetilde{H}} = \pi_{p^{l-l'}}(\sum_{i=1}^{d'} p^{n_i}\mathbb{Z}_p\mathbf{e}_i)$ is $\widetilde{H}$-invariant, for any $h \in \widetilde{H}$, $i \leq i_0 - 1$, and $j \geq i_0$ we have that

$$|\mathbf{e}_j^*(\mathrm{Ad}(h)(p^{n_i}\mathbf{e}_i))|_p \leq 1/p^{n_j},$$

and so for any $h \in \widetilde{H}$ we have

$$|\mathbf{e}_j^*(\mathrm{Ad}(h)(\mathbf{e}_i))|_p \leq 1/p^{n_j - n_i} \leq 1/p^{n_{i_0} - n_{i_0-1}} = 1/p^{-\Theta_{\mathcal{G}}(l)}. \tag{30}$$

Now by (28), (29), (30), and the fact that we can assume that l is large enough, we get the claim.

Case 2. $\underline{W_{\widetilde{H}}}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ projects onto a proper subspace W_s of $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ which is not $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-invariant.

Since W_s is not $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-invariant, by Lemma 32 and strong approximation we have that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_S)$ does not leave $\pi_{p^{O_{\mathcal{G}}(1)}}(W_s \cap \mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p))$ invariant. Now one can argue as in Case 1.

Case 3. $\underline{W_{\widetilde{H}}}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ projects onto a proper subspace W_s of $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ which is $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-invariant.

Since $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is a completely reducible $\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-module and the simple factors are the Lie algebras of the simple factors of $\mathbb{G}_s$, there is $M \subset \underline{\mathfrak{g}}_s(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ with the following properties:

(1) M is a primitive $\mathbb{Z}_p$-submodule of $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ (i.e. its $\mathbb{Z}_p$-basis can be extended to a $\mathbb{Z}_p$-basis of $\underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$).
(2) $[W_s, M] = 0$.
(3) $W_s \cap M = 0$.

Let $x \in M \setminus pM$ (since M is primitive, this condition is equivalent to $\|x\|_p = 1$).

Let $h \in \widetilde{H}$ and suppose $h \in G[p^k] \setminus G[p^{k+1}]$ for some $k < l' := \lceil l/2 \rceil + m_0$. Then

$$\log h \in (p^k\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p) \cap \underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p)) \setminus p^{k+1}\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p).$$

So

$$\log h^{p^{l'-k}} = p^{l'-k}\log h \in p^{l'}\mathfrak{gl}_{N_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)\cap \log \widetilde{H}.$$

Hence $\pi_{p^{n_{i_0}}}(p^{-k}\log h)\in \pi_{p^{n_{i_0}}}(W_{\widetilde{H}})$. This implies that there is $y\in W_s$ such that

$$p^{-k}\log h \in y + p^{n_{i_0}}\underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p)+\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p).$$

And so

$$\mathrm{ad}(\log h)(x)\in p^{\Theta_{\mathcal{G}}(l)}\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_s(\mathbb{Z}_p)\oplus(\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap p^{m_0}\underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p)).$$

Thus we have

$$\mathrm{Ad}(h)(x)=\exp(\mathrm{ad}(\log h))(x)\in x+p^{\Theta_{\mathcal{G}}(l)}\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_s(\mathbb{Z}_p)+\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p).$$

Now consider the action of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ on $\overline{\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_s(\mathbb{Z}_p)}:=\underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p)/(\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)\cap\underline{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{Z}_p))$. And let $\overline{W}_{\widetilde{H}}$ be the projection of $\mathbb{Z}_p x+W_{\widetilde{H}}$ to $\overline{\underline{\mathfrak{g}}_s(\mathbb{Z}_p)}$. So by the above discussion, $\pi_{p^{\Theta_{\mathcal{G}}(l)}}(\overline{W}_{\widetilde{H}})$ is $\widetilde{H}$-invariant but not $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$-invariant (for large enough l). Now one can get the claim as in Case 1. □

Claim 2. Let $\eta_g(w,l):=l(\mathrm{Ad}(g)(w))$ for $(w,l)\in\underline{\mathfrak{g}}(R)\times\underline{\mathfrak{g}}^*(R)$ and $g\in\mathcal{G}(R)$ and $\mathbb{Z}_S$-algebra R. If δ is small enough, there is $(w,l)\in(\underline{\mathfrak{g}}\times\underline{\mathfrak{g}}^*)(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ such that

(1) For any $h\in\mathcal{L}_\delta(\widetilde{H})$ we have $\eta_h(w,l)=0$,
(2) For some $\gamma\in\Omega'$ we have $\eta_\gamma(w,l)\neq 0$.

Proof of Claim 2. First we notice that Claim 1 implies that there is $(x_0,y_0)\in(\underline{\mathfrak{g}}\times\underline{\mathfrak{g}}^*)(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ such that

(1) For any $h\in\mathcal{L}_\delta(\widetilde{H})$ we have $|\eta_h(x_0,y_0)|_p\leq[\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p):\widetilde{H}]^{-(1-1/C)c}$,
(2) For some $\gamma\in\Omega'$ we have $\eta_\gamma(x_0,y_0)=p^{\Theta_{\Omega'}(1)}$.

To prove the claim, we proceed by contradiction and use an effective version of Nullstellensatz theorem [BY91]. To be precise, we assume that the following has no solution over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$:

$$\forall\, h\in\mathcal{L}_\delta(\widetilde{H}),\ \eta_h(x,y)=0,\ \eta_\gamma(x,y)=p^{n_0},$$

where $\gamma\in\Omega'$ and $n_0=\Theta_{\Omega'}(1)$ are the ones given above. So by the effective Nullstellensatz, e.g. [BY91], there are polynomials $q_\gamma,q_h\in\mathbb{Z}_S[\underline{\mathfrak{g}}\times\underline{\mathfrak{g}}^*]$ and $D_0\in\mathbb{Z}_S$ such that

$$q_\gamma(x,y)(\eta_\gamma(x,y)-p^{n_0})+\sum_{h\in\mathcal{L}_\delta(\widetilde{H})}q_h(x,y)\eta_h(x,y)=D_0,$$

and $\|D_0\|_S\leq[\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p):\widetilde{H}]^{\Theta(\delta)}$. After plugging in x_0 and y_0 we get a contradiction if δ is small enough. □

Claim 2 implies that $\mathcal{L}_\delta(\widetilde{H})$ is in a proper subvariety of $\mathbb{G}$. Now, as in [EMO05], using the generalized Bezout theorem we have that the group generated by $\mathcal{L}_{\Theta_{\dim\mathbb{G}}(\delta)}(\widetilde{H})$ is not Zariski-dense in $\mathbb{G}$.

□

Proof of Proposition 29. By strong approximation [Nor89] we know that $[\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p):\overline{\Gamma}]\ll_\Gamma 1$, where $\overline{\Gamma}$ is the closure of Γ in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. For a proper subgroup H of $\pi_{p^n}(\Gamma)$, let $\widetilde{H}:=\{h\in\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)|\ \pi_{p^n}(h)\in H\}$. So by Lemma 34 we have that $\mathcal{L}_{\delta_1}(\widetilde{H})$ is in a proper algebraic subgroup $\mathbb{H}$ of $\mathbb{G}$ for small enough δ_1. So by Proposition 12 we have that

$$\mathcal{P}^{(l)}(\{\gamma\in\Gamma|\ \pi_{p^n}(\gamma)\in H\})\leq e^{-\delta_0 l} \tag{31}$$

if $1\ll l\ll\delta_1\log[\pi_{p^n}(\Gamma):H]$ where δ_0 is given by Proposition 12 and δ_1 is given by Lemma 34.

If for some $l \geq \frac{n}{\delta}\log p$ we have $\mathcal{P}^{(l)}_{\pi_{p^n}(\Omega)}(H) \geq [\pi_{p^n}(\Gamma) : H]^{-\delta}$, then by [BG09, Remark, page 1060] (see [SG-b, Lemma 6]) for any $l' \leq \frac{n}{\delta}\log p$ we have $\mathcal{P}^{(2l')}_{\pi_{p^n}(\Omega)}(H) \geq [\pi_{p^n}(\Gamma) : H]^{-2\delta}$. This contradicts (31) if δ is small enough. □

5.2. **Getting a large ideal by adding/subtracting a congruence subgroup boundedly many times.** The main goal of this section is to prove Proposition 35. At the end we also provide a few lemmas that are needed for using Proposition 35 in the context of modules. The results of this section rely on properties of p-adic analytic maps that are proved in appendix.

Proposition 35. *Let $\mathbb{G}_s \subseteq \mathbb{GL}_{N_0}$ be a semisimple $\mathbb{Q}_p$-subgroup. Let $\rho : \mathbb{G}_s \to \mathbb{GL}(\mathbb{V})$ be a $\mathbb{Q}_p$-homomorphism. Let $P[p^l] := \{g \in \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \mathrm{GL}_{N_0} \mid \pi_{p^l}(g) = 1\}$. Suppose that $\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ has no non-zero $\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ fixed vector. Then for $l \gg_{\mathbb{G}_s,\rho} 1$ we have*

$$\textstyle\sum_{\Theta_{\mathbb{G}_s,\rho}(1)} \rho(P[p^l]) - \sum_{\Theta_{\mathbb{G}_s,\rho}(1)} \rho(P[p^l]) \supseteq p^{\Theta_{\mathbb{G}_s,\rho}(l)}\mathbb{Z}_p[\rho(P[1]))].$$

Lemma 36. *Let G be a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_{N_0}(K)$. Suppose $V := K^{N_0}$ is a completely reducible G-module, and V has no non-zero G-fixed vector. Then there is no $a \in M_{N_0}(K)$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}(ag) = 1$ for any $g \in G$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that there is such $a \in M_{N_0}(K)$. Let $A := K[G]$ be the K-span of G. Since A has a faithful semisimple finite dimensional A-module, A is a semisimple K-algebra. Let

$$\mathfrak{a} := \langle g - 1 |\ g \in G\rangle$$

be the ideal generated by $G - 1$ in A. Since $\mathrm{Tr}(ag) = 1$ for any $g \in G$, we have that $\mathrm{Tr}(ax) = 0$ for any $x \in \mathfrak{a}$. Thus $\mathfrak{a}$ is a proper ideal. On the other hand, since A is semisimple, by the idempotent decomposition there are $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in A$ such that

(1) $\alpha_i^2 = \alpha_i$,
(2) $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$,
(3) $\mathfrak{a} = A\alpha_1$.

Since $\mathfrak{a}$ is a proper ideal, $\alpha_1 \neq 1$. And so there is a non-zero vector $v \in V$ in the kernel of α_1, which implies that $\mathfrak{a}v = A\alpha_1 v = 0$. Therefore for any $g \in G$ we have $gv = v$ which contradicts the assumption that V does not have a non-zero G-fixed point. □

Proof of Proposition 35. Since $\mathbb{G}_s$ is a semisimple group, $\mathbb{V}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$ is a completely reducible $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p[\rho(\mathbb{G}_s(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p))]$-module. As $\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is Zariski-dense in $\mathbb{G}_s(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p)$, we have that $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p[\rho(\mathbb{G}_s(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p))] = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p[\rho(\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p))]$. Therefore $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p[\rho(\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p))]$ has a faithful completely reducible module, which implies that $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p[\rho(\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p))]$ is a semisimple algebra. Hence the nilradical of $\mathbb{Q}_p[\rho(\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p))]$ is zero, too. Thus $\mathbb{Q}_p[\rho(\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p))$ is a semisimple algebra and $\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is a completely reducible $\mathbb{Q}_p[\rho(\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p))]$-module. Hence Lemma 36 implies that the constant function $\mathbb{1}$ does not belong to the linear span of the analytic functions ρ_{ij} where ρ_{ij} are the entries of $\rho : \mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p) \to \mathrm{GL}(\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p))$ with respect to a $\mathbb{Q}_p$-basis of $\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. So we get the desired result by Proposition 41. □

Next we prove a corollary of Lemma 31.

Corollary 37. *Let $R \subseteq M_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_p$-subalgebra. Let*

$$0 = W_{k_0+1} \subseteq W_{k_0} \subseteq \ldots \subseteq W_1 = \mathbb{Q}_p^{n_0}$$

be a composition series of $\mathbb{Q}_p^{n_0}$ as an $\mathbb{Q}_p[R]$-module, where $\mathbb{Q}_p[R]$ is the $\mathbb{Q}_p$-span of R. Suppose $v_i \in M_i := W_i \cap \mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}$ and $\|\overline{v_i}\| := \inf\{\|v_i + w\|_p |\ w \in W_{i+1}\} \geq q^{-1}$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_0} Rv_i \supseteq q^{\Theta_{R,\{W_j\}}(1)}\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 31 we have that, for any $1 \leq i \leq k_0$,

$$q^{\Theta_{R,W_i}(1)} M_i \subseteq Rv_i + M_{i+1} \subseteq M_i.$$

By induction on i one can easily see that, for any $1 \leq i \leq k_0$, we have

$$q^{\Theta_{R,\{W_j\}}(1)} \mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0} = q^{\Theta_{R,\{W_j\}}(1)} M_1 \subseteq \sum_{j=1}^{i} Rv_j + M_{i+1}.$$

□

Lemma 38. *Let $R \subseteq M_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_S)$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_S$-subalgebra. Assume the $\mathbb{Q}$-span $\mathbb{Q}[R]$ of R is a semisimple algebra. Suppose p is a large prime number (depending on R), and W is a composition factor of $\mathbb{Q}_p^{n_0}$, i.e. there are two $\mathbb{Q}_p[R]$-submodoules $W_1 \subseteq W_2$ such that $W = W_2/W_1$ is a simple $\mathbb{Q}_p[R]$-module. Then for any $v \in W_{\mathbb{Z}_p} := (W_2 \cap \mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}) + W_1/W_1$ we have $\mathbb{Z}_p[R]v = M_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$ if $v \notin pM_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$.*

Proof. By Wedderburn theorem and Artin-Brauer-Noether theorem, for large enough p we have that

(1) $\mathbb{Q}_p[R] \simeq \bigoplus_i M_{n_i}(K_i)$ where K_i are finite extensions of $\mathbb{Q}_p$,
(2) under the above identification $\mathbb{Z}_p[R]$ gets identified with $\bigoplus_i M_{n_i}(\mathcal{O}_{K_i})$,
(3) under the above identification $\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}$ naturally gets identified with $\bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{K_i}^{n_i}$.

Hence $W_{\mathbb{Z}_p}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{K_i}^{n_i}$ where $\mathbb{Z}_p[R]$ acts via $M_{n_i}(\mathcal{O}_{K_i})$. It is clear that for any unit vector $v \in \mathcal{O}_{K_i}^{n_i}$ we have $M_{n_i}(\mathcal{O}_{K_i})v = \mathcal{O}_{K_i}^{n_i}$. □

Corollary 39. *Let $R \subseteq M_{n_0}(\mathbb{Z}_S)$ be a $\mathbb{Z}_S$-subalgebra. Assume the $\mathbb{Q}$-span $\mathbb{Q}[R]$ of R is a semisimple algebra. Let*

$$0 = W_{k_0+1} \subseteq W_{k_0} \subseteq \ldots \subseteq W_1 = \mathbb{Q}_p^{n_0}$$

be a composition series of $\mathbb{Q}_p^{n_0}$ as an $\mathbb{Q}_p[R]$-module, where $\mathbb{Q}_p[R]$ is the $\mathbb{Q}_p$-span of R. Suppose $v_i \in M_i := W_i \cap \mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0}$ and $\|\overline{v_i}\| := \inf\{\|v_i + w\|_p |\ w \in W_{i+1}\} = 1$. Then, for large enough p, we have

$$\mathbb{Z}_p^{n_0} = \sum_{i=1}^{k_0} Rv_i.$$

Proof. It is a direct corollary of Lemma 38. □

5.3. **Getting a p-adically large vector in a submodule in boundedly many steps.** The main goal of this short section is proving a key lemma (Lemma 40). Using this Lemma, we will be able to get a $\mathbb{Q}_p$-basis of $\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ consisting of *large* vectors in *boundedly many steps*.

Lemma 40. *Let Ω, Γ and $\mathbb{G}$ be as above. Let $\mathbb{V}' \subseteq \mathbb{V}$ be a non-zero $\mathbb{Q}_p$-subgroup which is $\mathbb{G}_s$-invariant. For any $0 < \varepsilon \ll_{\Omega,\mathbb{V}'} 1$, there are $\delta > 0$ and a positive integer C such that the following holds:*

Suppose p is a prime number, $Q = p^n$ and $n\varepsilon \gg_{\Omega,\mathbb{V}'} 1$. Suppose the closure Q_p of Γ in $\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ contains $K_p \ltimes V_p$ where K_p is an open compact subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and V_p is an open compact subgroup of $\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.

If $\mathfrak{P}_Q(\delta, A, l)$ holds and $\pi_Q(\Gamma[q_2]) \subseteq \pi_Q(\prod_C A)\pi_Q(V_p \cap \mathbb{V}'(\mathbb{Q}_p))$ where $q_2 = p^{n_2}$ and $n_2 \leq \varepsilon^2 n$, then

$$\{v \in \mathbb{V}'(\mathbb{Q}_p) |\ \|v\|_p > Q^{\varepsilon},\ \pi_Q(v) \in \pi_Q(\textstyle\prod_{4C} A)\} \tag{32}$$

is non-empty.

Proof. Clearly $\pi_Q(V_p \cap \mathbb{V}'(\mathbb{Q}_p))$ is $\pi_Q(K_p)$-invariant. So $\pi_Q(V_p \cap \mathbb{V}'(\mathbb{Q}_p))$ is a normal subgroup of $\pi_Q(Q_p)$. Let $\eta_{q_1} : \pi_{q_1}(Q_p) \to \pi_{q_1}(Q_p)/\pi_{q_1}(V_p \cap \mathbb{V}'(\mathbb{Q}_p))$ be the projection map where $q_1 = p^{n_1}$ and $n_1 = \lfloor \varepsilon n \rfloor$. So by the assumption there is a section

$$s : \eta_{q_1}(\pi_Q(Q_p[q_2])) \to \pi_{q_1}(Q_p)$$

such that the image of s is a subset of $\pi_{q_1}(\prod_C A)$ (by section we mean $\eta_{q_1}(s(x)) = x$). Notice that

$$\eta_{q_1}(s(x_1^{-1}x_2)^{-1}s(x_1)s(x_2^{-1})) = \eta_{q_1}(s(x_1^{-1}x_2))^{-1}\eta_{q_1}(s(x_1))\eta_{q_1}(s(x_2^{-1})) = (x_1^{-1}x_2)^{-1}(x_1)(x_2^{-1}) = 1.$$

Hence $s(x_1^{-1}x_2)^{-1}s(x_1)s(x_2^{-1}) \in \pi_{q_1}(\prod_{3C} A) \cap \pi_{q_1}(V_p \cap \mathbb{V}'(\mathbb{Q}_p))$. Now if we assume to the contrary that the set in (32) is empty, then $\pi_{q_1}(\prod_{3C} A) \cap \pi_{q_1}(V_p \cap \mathbb{V}'(\mathbb{Q}_p)) = \{1\}$. And so s is a group homomorphism. So $H := \mathrm{Im}(s)$ is a subgroup of $\pi_{q_1}(Q_p)$, and $[\pi_{q_1}(Q_P) : H] \geq |\pi_{q_1}(V_P \cap \mathbb{V}'(\mathbb{Q}_p))| \geq p^{\Theta_{\mathbb{V}'}(n\varepsilon)}$. By Proposition 29 we have that

$$\mathcal{P}^{(l)}_{\pi_{q_1}(\Omega)}(H) \leq [\pi_{q_1}(\Gamma) : H]^{-\Theta_\Omega(1)} \leq p^{-\Theta_{\Omega,\mathbb{V}'}(n\varepsilon)}. \tag{33}$$

On the other hand, if $x \in \pi_{q_1}(\prod_{2C} A) \cap \pi_{q_1}(\Gamma[q_2])$, then

$$x^{-1}s(\eta_{q_1}(x))) \in \pi_{q_1}(\textstyle\prod_{4C} A) \cap \pi_{q_1}(V_p \cap \mathbb{V}'(\mathbb{Q}_p)).$$

So by the contrary assumption we have that $x \in H$. By the assumption we have $\mathcal{P}^{(l)}(A) > Q^{-\delta}$ (where δ is small positive number to be determined later). So $\mathcal{P}^{(l)}(A \cap \pi_{q_2}^{-1}(x)) > Q^{-\delta}p^{-\Theta_\Omega(n\varepsilon^2)} = p^{-n(\delta+\Theta_\Omega(\varepsilon^2))}$. Hence $\mathcal{P}^{(l)}(A \cdot A \cap \Gamma[q_2]) > p^{-n\Theta_\Omega(\varepsilon^2)}$ for small enough δ. Therefore by the above discussion and (33) we have

$$-n\Theta_\Omega(\varepsilon^2) < -n\Theta_{\Omega,\mathbb{V}'}(\varepsilon),$$

which is a contradiction if $0 < \varepsilon \ll_{\Omega,\mathbb{V}'} 1$. □

5.4. **Proof of super-approximation: the p-adic case.** Let $P[p^k] := \{g \in \mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p) | \ \|g - 1\|_p \leq p^{-k}\}$ for any non-negative integer k. Let $\mathbb{V}_i$ be $\mathbb{Q}_p$-subgroups of $\mathbb{V}$ such that

(1) $\mathbb{V}_i(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ are irreducible $\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-modules.
(2) $\mathbb{V} = \oplus_{i=1}^{k_0}\mathbb{V}_i$.

Inductively we do the following simultaneously:

(1) construct a permutation $\sigma : \{1, \ldots, k_0\} \to \{1, \ldots, k_0\}$,
(2) find vectors $v_j \in W_j := \bigoplus_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k_0\} \setminus \{\sigma(1),\ldots,\sigma(j-1)\}} \mathbb{V}_{\sigma(i)}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$,

such that the following holds:

(1) for small enough δ, large enough C (depending on ε, Ω, and $\mathbb{V}_i$) and any $1 \leq j \leq k_0$ we have

$$\pi_Q\left(\Gamma[p^{n(\varepsilon^{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)})}]\right) \subseteq \pi_Q(\textstyle\prod_{\Theta(C)} A)\pi_Q(V_p \cap W_j); \tag{34}$$

(2) $v_j \in W_j$;
(3) $\overline{v}_1, \ldots, \overline{v}_j$ generate W_1/W_{j+1} as a $\mathbb{G}_s(\mathbb{Q}_p)$-module, where $\overline{v}_i$ is the projection of v_i.
(4) $\log_p \|\overline{v}_j\|_p \gg n\varepsilon^{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)}$;
(5) $\sum_{i=1}^{j}\left(\sum_{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)} \rho(P[p^{n(\varepsilon^{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)})}])(v_j) - \sum_{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)} \rho(P[p^{n(\varepsilon^{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)})}])(v_j)\right) + W_{j+1} \supseteq p^{n(\varepsilon^{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)})}V_p$.

By [SG-b, Theorem 31], if δ is small enough and C is large enough, (34) holds for $j = 1$. Now we suppose (34) holds for $1 \leq j \leq j_0$ and we have already found $v_1, \ldots, v_{j_0-1}$ as desired. We will define $\sigma(j_0)$ and find v_{j_0} so that the above properties hold.

Since (34) holds for $j = j_0$, by Lemma 40 there is $v_{j_0} \in W_{j_0}$ such that

$$\log_p \|v_{j_0}\|_p \gg n\varepsilon^{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)}, \text{ and } \pi_Q(v_{j_0}) \in \pi_Q(\textstyle\prod_{\Theta(C)} A). \tag{35}$$

Since $\log_p \|v_{j_0}\|_p \gg n\varepsilon^{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)}$, the projection $\overline{v}_{j_0}$ of v_{j_0} to $\mathbb{V}_{\sigma(j_0)}$ for some

$$\sigma(j_0) \in \{1, \ldots, k_0\} \setminus \{\sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(j_0 - 1)\}$$

has length at least $\Theta_{\mathbb{V}_i}(p^{\Theta(n\varepsilon^{\Theta_\mathbb{G}(1)})})$. Now by Corollaries 37 and 39 one gets all the mentioned properties except the first one.

By [SG-b, Theorem 31] we have that for small enough δ and large enough C

$$\pi_Q(P[p^{n\varepsilon^{\Theta(1)}}]) \subseteq \pi_Q(\prod_C A)\pi_Q(V_p). \tag{36}$$

To simplify our notation let us drop the constant power of ε in the rest of the argument. Hence by (35) we have

$$\pi_Q(p^{n\varepsilon}V_p) \subseteq \pi_Q(\prod_{\Theta(C)} A)\pi_Q(V_p \cap W_j). \tag{37}$$

For any $g_1, g_2 \in P[p^{n\varepsilon}]$ and $v_1, v_2 \in V_p$, we have

$$[(g_1, v_1), (g_2, v_2)] \in P[p^{2n\varepsilon}] \ltimes (p^{n\varepsilon}V_p).$$

Hence by (36) and (37) we have

$$\pi_Q(\{[g_1, g_2]|\ g_1, g_2 \in P[p^{n\varepsilon}]\}) \subseteq \pi_Q(\prod_{\Theta(C)} A)\pi_Q(V_p \cap W_j). \tag{38}$$

Let $X := \{[g_1, g_2]|\ g_1, g_2 \in P[p^{n\varepsilon}]\}$. Using properties of finite logarithmic maps [SG-b, Lemma 29], we have

$$(\prod_{\dim \mathbb{G}_s} X \cap P[p^{kn\varepsilon+\Theta(1)}])P[p^{2kn\varepsilon}] = P[p^{kn\varepsilon+\Theta(1)}],$$

for any integer $k \geq 2$. Therefore $\pi_Q(\prod_{\Theta(-\log\varepsilon)} X) \supseteq \pi_Q(P[p^{n\Theta(\varepsilon)}])$. Hence

$$\pi_Q(P[p^{n\Theta(\varepsilon)}]) \subseteq \pi_Q(\prod_{\Theta(C)} A)\pi_Q(V_p \cap W_j). \tag{39}$$

And so by (37) and (39) we have

$$\pi_Q(\Gamma[p^{n\Theta(\varepsilon)}]) \subseteq \pi_Q(\prod_{\Theta(C)} A)\pi_Q(V_p \cap W_j),$$

which finishes the proof.

6. Appendix A: quantitative open image for p-adic analytic maps.

The main goal of this appendix is to prove that one can get a *large open set* by adding the image of an analytic function in controlled number of times (see Proposition 41).

Proposition 41. *Let K be a characteristic zero non-Archimedean local field. Let $\mathcal{O} := \mathcal{O}_K$ be its ring of integers, and $\mathfrak{p}$ be a uniformizing element. Let $U \subseteq K^{n_0}$ be a neighborhood of the origin, and $F := (f_1, \dots, f_{d_0}) : U \to K^{d_0}$ be an analytic function. Suppose the constant function $\mathbb{1}$ is not in the K-span of f_i. Then for any $l \gg_F 1$ we have*

$$\textstyle\sum_{\Theta_F(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{n_0}) - \sum_{\Theta_F(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{n_0}) \supseteq (K\text{-span of } F(U)) \cap \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_F(l)}\mathcal{O}^{d_0}.$$

In fact, we prove the following refinement of Proposition 41. In Proposition 41′, we pinpoint how the implied constants depend on the given analytic functions (with a few extra technical assumptions). This type of control helps us to prove Corollary 42. Corollary 42 is the only result in the appendix that is needed in the main part of the article. In Corollary 42, we deal with polynomial maps that are defined over a number field, and prove that their images in all the non-Archimedean completions are *uniformly large*.

Proposition 41′. *Let K be a characteristic zero non-Archimedean local field. Let $\mathcal{O} := \mathcal{O}_K$ be its ring of integers, and $\mathfrak{p}$ be a uniformizing element. Let $F := (f_1, \dots, f_{d_0}) : \mathcal{O}^{n_0} \to \mathcal{O}^{d_0}$ be an analytic function of the form*

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} (c_{\mathbf{i},1}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}, \dots, c_{\mathbf{i},d_0}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}),$$

where $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{n_0})$ ranges over multi-indexes non-negative integers and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} = x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_{n_0}^{i_{n_0}}$. Suppose

1. *$|c_{\mathbf{i},j}|_{\mathfrak{p}} \leq 1$ for any $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$ and any $1 \leq j \leq d_0$,*
2. *$L : K^{d_0'} \to K^{d_0}$ is a linear embedding such that $F(\mathbf{x}) = L(f_{j_1}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, f_{j_{d_0'}}(\mathbf{x}))$ for some indexes $1 \leq j_u \leq d_0$,*

(3) $|\det(c_{\mathbf{i}_i,j_u})_{1\le i,u\le d_0'}|_{\mathfrak{p}} = |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|_{\mathfrak{p}}$ *for some multi-indexes* $\mathbf{i}_1,\dots,\mathbf{i}_{d_0'}$ *whose coordinates add up to a number at most* m_0 *and some indexes* $j_1,\dots,j_{d_0'}$.

Then for any $l \gg_{d_0',n_0,m_0,k_0,\|L\|_{\mathfrak{p}}} 1$ *we have*

$$\textstyle\sum_{\Theta(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{n_0}) - \sum_{\Theta(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{n_0}) \supseteq (K\text{-span of } F(U)) \cap \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta(l)}\mathcal{O}^{d_0},$$

where all the implied constants depend on d_0, n_0, m_0 *and* k_0.

Corollary 42. *Let* κ *be a number field. Let* $f_1,\dots,f_{d_0} \in \kappa[x_1,\dots,x_{n_0}]$. *Suppose* $\mathbb{1}, f_1,\dots,f_{d_0}$ *are linearly independent where* $\mathbb{1}$ *is the constant polynomial one. Let* $F := (f_1,\dots,f_{d_0})$. *Then for any* $l \gg_F 1$ *and any* $\mathfrak{p} \in V_f(\kappa)$ *we have*

$$\textstyle\sum_{\Theta_F(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_0}) - \sum_{\Theta_F(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_0}) \supseteq (\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}\text{-span of } F(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}})) \cap \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_F(l)}\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{d_0},$$

where $\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}$ *is the completion of* κ *with respect to the finite place* $\mathfrak{p} \in V_f(\kappa)$, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ *is the ring of integers of* $\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}$, *and* $\mathfrak{p}$ *also shows a uniformizing element of* $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Let us recall the needed notation from $\mathfrak{p}$-adic analysis. If U is an open subset of K, then $\nabla^k U := \{(x_1,\dots,x_k) \in U\times\cdots\times U |\ x_i \ne x_j \text{ if } i\ne j\}$. If $f : U \to K$, then $\Phi^k f : \nabla^{k+1}U \to K$ is defined recursively

$$\nabla^k f(x_1,\dots,x_k) := \frac{\nabla^{k-1}f(x_1,x_3,\dots,x_k) - \nabla^{k-1}f(x_2,\dots,x_k)}{x_1-x_2},$$

and $\Phi^0 f = f$. If f is an analytic function, then $\Phi^n f$ can be uniquely extended to a continuous function $\overline{\Phi}^n f : U^{n+1} \to K$ for any n and $f^{(i)}(a) = i!\overline{\Phi}^i f(a,\dots,a)$. Similarly for open subsets $U_i \subseteq K$ and a (multi-variable) function $f : U_1\times\cdots\times U_m \to K$ we can define the kth order difference quotient $\Phi_i^k f$ of f with respect to the ith variable. And then for a multi-index $\mathbf{i} := (i_1,\dots,i_m)$ we set

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{i}} f : \nabla^{i_1+1}U_1\times\cdots\times\nabla^{i_m+1}U_m \to K, \qquad \Phi_{\mathbf{i}} f := \Phi_1^{i_1}\circ\Phi_2^{i_2}\circ\cdots\circ\Phi_m^{i_m} f.$$

If f is analytic, then $\Phi_{\mathbf{i}} f$ can be uniquely extended to a continuous function $\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{i}} f : U_1^{i_1+1}\times\cdots\times U_m^{i_m+1} \to K$, and

$$\partial_{\mathbf{i}} f(a_1,\dots,a_m) = \mathbf{i}!\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{i}} f(\theta_{\mathbf{i}}(a_1,\dots,a_m)),$$

where $\mathbf{i}! := i_1!i_2!\cdots i_m!$ and

$$\theta_{\mathbf{i}}(a_1,\dots,a_m) := (\underbrace{a_1,\dots,a_1}_{i_1+1-\text{times}},\underbrace{a_2,\dots,a_2}_{i_2+1-\text{times}},\dots,\underbrace{a_m,\dots,a_m}_{i_m+1-\text{times}}).$$

Let $U := U_1\times\cdots\times U_m \subseteq K^m$ be an open subset, $f_i : U \to K$ be analytic functions, and $F := (f_1,\dots,f_d) : U \to K^d$ (in computations, it is considered as a d-by-1 column matrix). Then $dF(\mathbf{x})$ is a d-by-m matrix

$$dF(\mathbf{x}) := [\partial_j f_i(\mathbf{x})].$$

For any $1 \le i,j \le m$, let $\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j} F(\bullet)$ be the column vector whose kth entry is $\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j} f_k(\bullet)$. In the above setting, by Taylor expansion we have

$$F(\mathbf{x}_0+\mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{x}_0) + dF(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathbf{x} + R_2F(\mathbf{x}_0+\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}_0), \tag{40}$$

where $R_2F(\mathbf{x}_0+\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}_0)$ is of the following $\sum_{i,j} x_ix_j\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j}F(\bullet)$ (the entries are the entries of either $\mathbf{x}_0+\mathbf{x}$ or $\mathbf{x}_0$) and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1,\dots,x_m)$.

For a d-by-m matrix $X = [\mathbf{v}_1\cdots\mathbf{v}_m]$ with entries in K, let

$$N(X) := \max_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_d\le m} |\det[\mathbf{v}_{i_1}\cdots\mathbf{v}_{i_d}]|.$$

Lemma 43. (1) *If* $\mathbf{w}_1,\dots,\mathbf{w}_d$ *are the rows of* $X \in M_{d,m}(K)$, *then* $N(X) = \|\mathbf{w}_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\mathbf{w}_d\|$; *in particular* $N(X) = 0$ *if* $\operatorname{rank}(X) < d$.

(2) *If* $N(X) \ge |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$, *then for any positive integer* l *and* $\mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{p}^{l+k_0}\mathcal{O}^d$ *there is* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^m$ *such that* $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$.

(3) *For any $1 \leq i \leq m$ and vectors $\mathbf{v}_j$ we have*

$$N[\mathbf{v}_1 \cdots \mathbf{v}_i(\mathbf{v}_{i+1} - \mathbf{v}_i) \cdots (\mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{v}_i)] \leq (d+1)N[\mathbf{v}_1 \cdots \mathbf{v}_m].$$

Proof. The first part is clear. Now suppose that $N(X) \geq |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$; then there are d columns $\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{i_d}$ such that $|\det[\mathbf{v}_{i_1} \cdots \mathbf{v}_{i_d}]| \geq |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$. Let $X_I = [\mathbf{v}_{i_1} \cdots \mathbf{v}_{i_d}]$. Then $X_I \mathrm{adj}(X_I)\mathbf{y} = \det(X_I)\mathbf{y}$, and so there is $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^d$ such that $X_I\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{y}$. Therefore there is $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^m$ such that $X\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$.

For the third part, we get an upper-bound for the determinant of a d-by-d submatrix:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\det[\mathbf{v}_{i_1} \cdots \mathbf{v}_{i_j}(\mathbf{v}_{i_{j+1}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdots (\mathbf{v}_{i_d} - \mathbf{v})]| &= \|\mathbf{v}_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathbf{v}_{i_j} \wedge (\mathbf{v}_{i_{j+1}} - \mathbf{v}) \wedge \cdots \wedge (\mathbf{v}_{i_d} - \mathbf{v})\| \\
&= \|\mathbf{v}_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathbf{v}_{i_d} - \sum_{k=j+1}^{d} \mathbf{v}_{i_{j+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathbf{v}_{i_{k-1}} \wedge \mathbf{v} \wedge \mathbf{v}_{i_{k+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathbf{v}_{i_d}\| \\
&\leq (d+1)N([\mathbf{v}_1 \cdots \mathbf{v}_m]),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{v}$ is either 0 or $\mathbf{v}_i$. □

In what follows, a series of Lemmas are proved in pairs. In the first ones the constants depend on F, and they are geared towards proving Proposition 41. In the second ones, we make the needed modification and make them suitable for proving Proposition 41′.

Lemma 44 (Hensel's lemma)**.** *Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K^m$ and $U \subseteq K^m$ be an open neighborhood of $\mathbf{x}_0$. Let $f_i : U \to K$ be analytic functions and $F = (f_1, \ldots, f_d)$. Suppose there is a positive integer k_0 such that*

(1) $\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^{k_0}\mathcal{O}^m \subseteq U$,
(2) $\|dF(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \leq 1$,
(3) $\|\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j}F(\mathbf{x}')\| \leq 1$ *if* $\|\mathbf{x}' - \theta_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \leq |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$,
(4) $N(dF(\mathbf{x}_0)) \geq |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$.

Then for any $l \geq k_0$ and any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{O}^d$ there is $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^m$ such that

$$\|F(\mathbf{x}_1) - F(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathfrak{p}^{l+k_0}\mathbf{y}\| \leq |\mathfrak{p}^{2l}|.$$

Proof. By (40) we have that

$$\|F(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^l\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathfrak{p}^l dF(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathbf{x}\| = \|\sum_{i,j}(\mathfrak{p}^l x_i)(\mathfrak{p}^l x_j)\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j}F(\mathbf{x}_{ij})\|, \tag{41}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_{ij} - \theta_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \leq |\mathfrak{p}^l|$. Now by Lemma 43 for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{O}^d$ there is $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{O}^m$ such that $dF(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathbf{x} = \mathfrak{p}^{k_0}\mathbf{y}$. And so by (41)

$$\|F(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^l\mathbf{x}) - F(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathfrak{p}^{l+k_0}\mathbf{y}\| \leq |\mathfrak{p}^{2l}|.$$

□

Lemma 45 (Quantitative open function theorem)**.** *Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K^m$ and $U \subseteq K^m$ be an open neighborhood of $\mathbf{x}_0$. Let $f_i : U \to K$ be analytic functions and $F = (f_1, \ldots, f_d)$. Suppose*

(1) $\|dF(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \leq 1$,
(2) $\|\partial_{ij}F(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \leq 1$,
(3) $N(dF(\mathbf{x}_0)) \geq |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$.

Then for any large enough integer l (depending on F and U) we have

$$F(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^m) \supseteq F(\mathbf{x}_0) + \mathfrak{p}^{l+k_0}\mathcal{O}^d.$$

Proof. By the continuity of dF and $\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j}F$, for large enough l (in particular $l > k_0$), we have that

(1) $\|dF(\mathbf{x})\| \le 1$ if $\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_0\| \le |\mathfrak{p}^l|$,
(2) $\|\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j}F(\mathbf{x}')\| \le 1$ if $\|\mathbf{x}'-\theta_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \le |\mathfrak{p}^l|$,
(3) $N(dF(\mathbf{x})) \ge |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$ if $\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_0\| \le |\mathfrak{p}^l|$.

By induction on i we prove that for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{O}^d$ there are $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^m$ and integers $l_i \ge 2l$ such that

(1) $l_1 := 2l$ and $l_{i+1} := 2(l_i - k_0)$,
(2) $\|F(\mathbf{x}_i) - F(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathfrak{p}^{l+k_0}\mathbf{y}\| \le |\mathfrak{p}^{l_i}|$.

Lemma 44 gives us the base of the induction. By induction hypothesis, there is $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^m$ such that

$$F(\mathbf{x}_i) - F(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathfrak{p}^{l+k_0}\mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{p}^{l_i}\mathcal{O}^d.$$

Hence by Lemma 44 there is $\mathbf{x}_{i+1} \in \mathbf{x}_i + \mathfrak{p}^{l_i-k_0}\mathcal{O}^m \subseteq \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^m$ such that

$$\|F(\mathbf{x}_{i+1}) - F(\mathbf{x}_i) + (F(\mathbf{x}_i) - F(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathfrak{p}^{l+k_0}\mathbf{y})\| \le |\mathfrak{p}^{2(l_i-k_0)}| = |\mathfrak{p}^{l_{i+1}}|.$$

This proves the induction step. One can easily see that $\{l_i\}$ is a strictly increasing integer sequence. So $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Therefore $\lim_{i\to\infty}\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^m$ by the compactness of $\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^m$, and by the continuity of F we have $F(\mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{x}_0) + \mathfrak{p}^{l+k_0}\mathbf{y}$. □

Lemma 45′. *Let $F := (f_1, \dots, f_{d_0}) : \mathcal{O}^{n_0} \to \mathcal{O}^{d_0}, F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}}(c_{\mathbf{i},1}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}, \dots, c_{\mathbf{i},d_0}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}})$ be an analytic function such that*

(1) *$|c_{\mathbf{i},j}| \le 1$ for any $\mathbf{i}$ and j,*
(2) *$N(dF(\mathbf{0})) \ge |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$.*

Then for any $l \gg_{k_0} 1$ we have

$$F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) \supseteq F(\mathbf{0}) + \mathfrak{p}^{l+k_0}\mathcal{O}^{d_0}.$$

Proof. Since $F(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{\mathbf{i}}(c_{\mathbf{i},1}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}, \dots, c_{\mathbf{i},d_0}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}})$ and $|c_{\mathbf{i},j}| \le 1$, we have $\|dF(\mathbf{x})\| \le 1$ and $\|\overline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{e}_i+\mathbf{e}_j}F(\mathbf{x}')\| \le 1$ for any $\|\mathbf{x}\| \le 1$ and $\|\mathbf{x}'\| \le 1$.

Since $|c_{\mathbf{i},j}| \le 1$ and $N(dF(\mathbf{0})) \ge |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$, we have that $N(dF(\mathbf{x})) \ge |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{p}^{k_0+1}\mathcal{O}$. One can finish the argument as in the proof of Lemma 45. □

Lemma 46. *Let U be a neighborhood of $0 \in K$, and $f_i : U \to K$ be analytic functions. Suppose $\mathbb{1}, f_1, \dots, f_d$ are linearly independent. Then for large enough m (depending on f_i) and large enough l (depending on f_i and m) we have that, for any $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}$,*

$$N([f_i'(x_j)]) \gg \prod_{1\le i<j\le m}|(x_i - x_j)|,$$

where the implied constant depends on f_i.

Proof. Notice that we can rescale, i.e. change f_i to $g_i(x) := f_i(\mathfrak{p}^k x)$, and make sure that $|f_i^{(j)}(0)| \le 1$ for any $1 \le i \le d$ and any positive integer j.

Since f_i are analytic and $\mathbb{1}, f_1, \dots, f_d$ are linearly independent, for large enough m we have that $\operatorname{rank}([f_i^{(j)}(0)]) = d$, where $1 \le i \le d$ and $1 \le j \le m$. So $N([f_i^{(j)}(0)]) = |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$ for some non-negative integer k_0. Hence by the continuity of $\overline{\Phi}^j f_i$, for large enough l, we have that $N([\overline{\Phi}^j f_i(\mathbf{x}_j)]) \gg 1$ if $\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{j+1}$ for any $1 \le j \le m$.

Let $F(x)$ be the column vector $[f_1(x)\cdots f_d(x)]^T$. Then by the repeated use of the third part of Lemma 43 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
N([f_i'(x_j)]) &= N[F'(x_1)\cdots F'(x_m)]\\
&\geq (d+1)^{-1}N[F'(x_1)(F'(x_2)-F'(x_1))\cdots(F'(x_m)-F'(x_1))]\\
&\geq (d+1)^{-1}\left(\prod_{i=2}^{m}|x_i-x_1|\right)N[F'(x_1)\overline{\Phi}^1F'(x_2,x_1)\cdots\overline{\Phi}^1F'(x_m,x_1)]\\
&\geq \cdots\\
&\geq (d+1)^{-m}\left(\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq m}|x_i-x_j|\right)N[F'(x_1)\overline{\Phi}^1F'(x_2,x_1)\overline{\Phi}^2F'(x_3,x_2,x_1)\cdots\overline{\Phi}^{m-1}F'(x_m,\ldots,x_1)]\\
&\gg \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq m}|x_i-x_j|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 46′. *Let $F:=(f_1,\ldots,f_{d_0}):\mathcal{O}\to\mathcal{O}^{d_0}, F(\mathbf{x})=\sum_i(c_{i,1}x^i,\ldots,c_{i,d_0}x^i)$ be an analytic function such that*

(1) $|c_{i,j}|\leq 1$ *for any i and j,*
(2) $|\det(c_{i_e,j})|=|\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$ *for some indexes $i_1,\ldots,i_{d_0}\leq m_0$.*

Then for any $l\gg_{k_0}1$ we have that, for any $x_1,\ldots,x_{m_0}\in\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}$,

$$N([f_i'(x_j)])\geq|\mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{k_0,d_0,m_0}(1)}|\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq m_0}|x_i-x_j|.$$

Proof. Since $|c_{i,j}|\leq 1$ and $|\det(c_{i,j})|=|\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$, we have that $N(\overline{\Phi}^jf_i(\mathbf{x}_j))\geq|\det(\overline{\Phi}^{i_e}f_j(\mathbf{x}_{i_e}))|=|\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$ for any $\mathbf{x}_j\in\mathfrak{p}^{k_0+1}\mathcal{O}^j$. Now one gets the claim as in the proof of Lemma 46. □

Lemma 47. *Let U be a neighborhood of $0\in K$, and $f_i:U\to K$ be analytic functions. Suppose $\mathbb{1},f_1,\ldots,f_d$ are linearly independent. Let $F=(f_1,\ldots,f_d)$. Then for any $l\gg_F 1$ we have*

$$\textstyle\sum_{\Theta_F(1)}F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O})-\sum_{\Theta_F(1)}F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O})\supseteq\mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_F(l)}\mathcal{O}^d.$$

Proof. By Lemma 46 for large enough m_0 (depending on F) and large enough l (depending on F and m_0) we have

$$N(d\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}))\gg\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq m_0}|x_i-x_j|,$$

where $\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x})=F(x_1)+\cdots+F(x_{m_0})$ and $\mathbf{x}=(x_1,\ldots,x_{m_0})$ has norm at most $|\mathfrak{p}^l|$. Let $\mathbf{x}_0=(x_1,\ldots,x_{m_0})$ be such that $|x_i|\leq|\mathfrak{p}^l|$ for any i and $|x_i-x_j|\geq|\mathfrak{p}^{2l}|$ for any $i\neq j$. So $N(d\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}_0))\gg\mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{F,m_0}(l)}$. By rescaling, if needed, we can assume that $|f_i^{(j)}(0)|\leq 1$ for any $1\leq i\leq d$ and any positive integer j. And so $\|d\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|\leq 1$ and $\|\partial_{ij}\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|\leq 1$. Therefore by Lemma 45 we have

$$\widetilde{F}(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{m_0})=\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}_0+\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{m_0})\supseteq\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}_0)+\mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{m_0,F}(l)}\mathcal{O}^d,$$

and so

$$\textstyle\sum_{m_0}F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O})-\sum_{m_0}F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O})=\widetilde{F}(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{m_0})-\widetilde{F}(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{m_0})\supseteq\mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{m_0,F}(l)}\mathcal{O}^d.$$

□

Lemma 47′. *Let $F:=(f_1,\ldots,f_{d_0}):\mathcal{O}\to\mathcal{O}^{d_0}, F(\mathbf{x})=\sum_i(c_{i,1}x^i,\ldots,c_{i,d_0}x^i)$ be an analytic function such that*

(1) $|c_{i,j}|\leq 1$ *for any i and j,*

(2) $|\det(c_{i_e,j})| = |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$ *for some indexes* $i_1, \dots, i_{d_0} \leq m_0$.

Then for any $l \gg_{k_0,m_0} 1$ *we have*

$$\sum_{m_0} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) - \sum_{m_0} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) \supseteq \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{m_0,d_0,k_0}(l)}\mathcal{O}^{d_0}.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 47, let $\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m_0} F(x_i)$. Hence by Lemma 46′ for $l \gg_{k_0} 1$ we have

$$N(d\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x})) \geq |\mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{k_0,d_0,m_0}(1)}| \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq m_0} |x_i - x_j|,$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{m_0}$. Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}^{m_0}$ be such that $|x_i - x_j| \geq |\mathfrak{p}^{2l}|$ for any $i \neq j$. Notice that, since $l \gg_{m_0} 1$, there is such $\mathbf{x}_0$. Hence

$$N(d\widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x}_0)) \geq |\mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{m_0,d_0,k_0}(l)}|.$$

Let $F_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}) := \widetilde{F}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}_0)$. Hence $F_{\mathbf{x}_0}$ has a Taylor series expansion and its coefficients have norm at most one. Moreover $N(dF_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{0})) \geq |\mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{m_0,d_0,k_0}(l)}|$. Therefore by Lemma 45′ we have

$$F_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) \supseteq F_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{0}) + \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{m_0,d_0,k_0}(l)}\mathcal{O}^{d_0}.$$

One can finish the proof as above. □

Lemma 48. *Let* $U \subseteq K^{n_0}$ *be a non-empty open subset. Let* $f_i : U \to K$ *be analytic functions such that* $\mathbb{1}, f_1, \dots, f_d$ *are linearly independent. Then there is a polynomial curve* $r : K \to K^{n_0}$ *such that* $\mathbb{1}, f_1 \circ r, \dots, f_d \circ r$ *are linearly independent, and defined on a neighborhood of* $0 \in K$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x}_0$ be a point in U. After rescaling, if needed, we can assume that $|\partial_{\mathbf{i}} f_j(\mathbf{x}_0)/\mathbf{i}!| \leq 1$ for any $\mathbf{i}$ which is not zero. Since $\mathbb{1}, f_1, \dots, f_d$ are linearly independent, for large enough m we have that

$$\operatorname{rank}[\partial_{\mathbf{i}} f_j(\mathbf{x}_0)]_{1\leq\|\mathbf{i}\|_1\leq m,\ 1\leq j\leq d} = d.$$

Thus

$$N([\partial_{\mathbf{i}} f_j(\mathbf{x}_0)/\mathbf{i}!]) = |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|, \tag{42}$$

where k_0 is a non-negative integer. Now let

$$r(t) := \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathfrak{p}(t, t^s, t^{s^2}, \dots, t^{s^{n_0-1}})$$

where s is sufficiently large (to be determined later). By the Taylor expansion of f_j we have

$$f_j(r(t)) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}\|_1} t^{\sum_{k=1}^{n_0} i_k s^{k-1}},$$

where $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{n_0})$ and $a_{\mathbf{i}}^{(j)} = \partial_{\mathbf{i}} f_j/\mathbf{i}!$. And so

$$f_j(r(t)) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{\{\mathbf{i}|\sum_k i_k s^{k-1}=n\}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}\|_1} \right) t^n. \tag{43}$$

We make the following two observations:

(1) $\sum_{\{\mathbf{i}|\sum_k i_k s^{k-1}=n\}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}\|_1} \equiv \sum_{\{\mathbf{i}|\|\mathbf{i}\|_\infty<s,\ \sum_k i_k s^{k-1}=n\}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}\|_1} \pmod{\mathfrak{p}^s}$,
(2) If $\|\mathbf{i}\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{i}'\|_\infty < s$ and $\sum_k i_k s^{k-1} = \sum_k i'_k s^{k-1}$, then $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{i}'$.

In particular we have

$$\sum_{\{\mathbf{i}|\sum_k i_k s^{k-1}=n\}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}\|_1} \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \geq s^{n_0} \\ a_{\mathbf{i}(n)}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}(n)\|_1} & 0 \leq n \leq s^{n_0} - 1 \end{cases} \pmod{\mathfrak{p}^s}$$

where $\mathbf{i}(n) := (i_1, \dots, i_{n_0})$ is the s-adic digits of n, i.e. $n = \sum_k i_k s^{k-1}$. Therefore we have

$$N\left(\left[\sum_{\{\mathbf{i}|\ \sum_k i_k s^{k-1}=n\}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}\|_1}\right]_{1\le n\le s^{n_0}-1,\ 1\le j\le d}\right) \equiv N([a_{\mathbf{i}(n)}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}(n)\|_1}]) \pmod{\mathfrak{p}^s}. \tag{44}$$

Now suppose $s > dm + k_0$; in particular, if $\|\mathbf{i}\|_1 \le m$, then $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{i}(n)$ for some $n < s^{n_0}$. And so we have

$$N([a_{\mathbf{i}(n)}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}(n)\|_1}]) \ge |\mathfrak{p}^{md+k_0}|. \tag{45}$$

Hence by (44), (45) and $s > dm + k_0$ we have

$$N\left(\left[\sum_{\{\mathbf{i}|\ \sum_k i_k s^{k-1}=n\}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}\|_1}\right]_{1\le n\le s^{n_0}-1,\ 1\le j\le d}\right) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}^s},$$

which implies that

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\left[\sum_{\{\mathbf{i}|\ \sum_k i_k s^{k-1}=n\}} a_{\mathbf{i}}^{(j)} \mathfrak{p}^{\|\mathbf{i}\|_1}\right]_{1\le n\le s^{n_0}-1,\ 1\le j\le d}\right) = d,$$

and $\mathbb{1}, f_1 \circ r, \dots, f_d \circ r$ are linearly independent. □

Lemma 48′. *Let $F := (f_1, \dots, f_{d_0}) : \mathcal{O}^{n_0} \to \mathcal{O}^{d_0}$ be an analytic function of the form*

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} (c_{\mathbf{i},1}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}, \dots, c_{\mathbf{i},d_0}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}),$$

where $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{n_0})$ ranges over multi-indexes non-negative integers and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} = x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_{n_0}^{i_{n_0}}$. Suppose

1. *$|c_{\mathbf{i},j}| \le 1$ for any $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$ and any $1 \le j \le d_0$,*
2. *$|\det(c_{\mathbf{i}_i,j})| = |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$ for some multi-indexes $\mathbf{i}_1, \dots, \mathbf{i}_{d_0}$ whose coordinates add up to a number at most m_0.*

Then there is a polynomial curve $r : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}^{n_0}$ such that $|\det(c'_{i_e,j})| \ge |\mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{m_0,d_0,k_0}(1)}|$ for some indexes $i_e \ll_{m_0,n_0,d_0,k_0} 1$ where $f_j \circ r(x) = \sum_i c'_{i,j} x^i$.

Proof. A close examination of proof of Lemma 48 yields that (44), (45) imply

$$N([c'_{i,j}]_{1\le i\le (d_0m_0+k_0+1)^{n_0}-1, 1\le j\le d}] \ge |\mathfrak{p}^{m_0d_0+k_0}|,$$

which gives us the claim. □

Corollary 49. *Let $U \subseteq K^{m_0}$ be a non-empty open set. Let $f_j : U \to K$ be analytic functions, and $F := (f_1, \dots, f_d)$. Suppose $\mathbb{1}, f_1, \dots, f_d$ are linearly independent. Then for any $l \gg_F 1$ we have*

$$\textstyle\sum_{\Theta_F(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) - \sum_{\Theta_F(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) \supseteq \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_F(l)}\mathcal{O}^d.$$

Proof. By Lemma 48 there is a polynomial curve r such that $\mathbb{1}, f_1 \circ r, \dots, f_d \circ r$ are linearly independent and defined on a neighborhood of $0 \in K$. Hence by Lemma 46 we are done. □

Corollary 49′. *Let $F := (f_1, \dots, f_{d_0}) : \mathcal{O}^{n_0} \to \mathcal{O}^{d_0}$ be an analytic function of the form*

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} (c_{\mathbf{i},1}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}, \dots, c_{\mathbf{i},d_0}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}),$$

where $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{n_0})$ ranges over multi-indexes non-negative integers. Suppose

1. *$|c_{\mathbf{i},j}| \le 1$ for any $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$ and any $1 \le j \le d_0$,*
2. *$|\det(c_{\mathbf{i}_i,j})| = |\mathfrak{p}^{k_0}|$ for some multi-indexes $\mathbf{i}_1, \dots, \mathbf{i}_{d_0}$ whose coordinates add up to a number at most m_0.*

Then for $l \gg_{m_0,n_0,d_0,k_0} 1$ we have

$$\sum_{\Theta(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) - \sum_{\Theta(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) \supseteq \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta(l)}\mathcal{O}^{d_0},$$

where all the implied constants depend on m_0, n_0, d_0, k_0.

Proof. This is direct corollary of Lemma 47′ and Lemma 48′. □

Proof of Proposition 41. Suppose $\{f_{i_1}, \ldots, f_{i_d}\}$ is a basis of $\sum_i Kf_i$. So $\mathbb{1}, f_{i_1}, \ldots, f_{i_d}$ are linearly independent. And moreover there is an injective linear map $L : K^d \to K^{d_0}$ such that $F = L \circ \overline{F}$, where $\overline{F}(\mathbf{x}) = (f_{i_1}(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, f_{i_d}(\mathbf{x}))$. By Corollary 49 we have that

$$\sum_{\Theta_{\overline{F}}(1)} \overline{F}(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) - \sum_{\Theta_{\overline{F}}(1)} \overline{F}(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) \supseteq \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_{\overline{F}}(l)}\mathcal{O}^d.$$

for any $l \gg_{\overline{F}} 1$. Applying L to the both sides and using the linearity of L we have

$$\sum_{\Theta_F(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) - \sum_{\Theta_F(1)} F(\mathfrak{p}^l\mathcal{O}) \supseteq \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_F(l)}L(\mathcal{O}^d) \supseteq \mathfrak{p}^{\Theta_F(l)}\mathcal{O}^{d_0} \cap \mathrm{Im}(L).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 41′. By a similar argument as in the proof of Proposition 41, Corollary 49′ implies the desired result. □

Proof of Corollary 42. Let $\mathcal{O}_\kappa$ be the ring of integers of κ. There is $a \in \mathcal{O}_\kappa$ such that for any i

$$\overline{f}_i(\mathbf{x}) := f_i(a\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{O}_\kappa[x_1, \ldots, x_{n_0}].$$

Suppose $\overline{f}_{j_1}, \ldots, \overline{f}_{j'_{d_0}}$ be a basis of $\sum_{i=1}^{d_0} \kappa\overline{f}_i$. So there is a linear embedding $L : \kappa^{d'_0} \to \kappa^{d_0}$ such that

$$(\overline{f}_1(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, \overline{f}_{d_0}(\mathbf{x})) = L(\overline{f}_{j_1}, \ldots, \overline{f}_{j_{d'_0}}).$$

So the operator norm of the induced linear embedding $L_\mathfrak{p} : \kappa_\mathfrak{p}^{d'_0} \to \kappa_\mathfrak{p}^{d_0}$ are uniformly bounded from infinity and zero.

Since $\overline{f}_{j_1}, \ldots, \overline{f}_{j_{d'_0}}$ are linearly independent, there are multi-indexes $\mathbf{i}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{i}_{d'_0}$ such that

$$0 \neq \det(c_{\mathbf{i}_i, j_u}) \in \mathcal{O}_\kappa,$$

where $\overline{f}_j(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} c_{\mathbf{i},j}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}$. So $|\det(c_{\mathbf{i}_i,j_u})|_\mathfrak{p} = 1$ for almost all $\mathfrak{p} \in V_f(\kappa)$.

By the above discussion, one can easily finish the proof using Proposition 41′. □

References

[BY91] C. Bernstein, A. Yger, *Effective Bezout identities in $\mathbb{Q}[z_1, \ldots, z_n]$,* Acta Math. **166** (1991) 69–120.

[BG06] E. Bombieri, W. Gubler, Heights in Diophantine geometry, Cambridge University press, New York, 2006.

[BGS94] J.-B. Bost, H. Gillet, C. Soulé, *Heights of projective varieties and positive Green forms,* JAMS **7**, no 4, (1994) 903–1027.

[BFLM11] J. Bourgain, A. Furman, E. Lindenstrauss, S. Moses, *Stationary measures and equidistribution for orbits of non-abelian semigroups on the torus,* JAMS **24**, no. 1, (2011) 231–280.

[BG08-a] J. Bourgain, A. Gamburd, *Uniform expansion bounds for Cayley graphs of* $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathfrak{f}_p)$, Ann. of Math. **167** (2008) 625–642.

[BG08-b] J. Bourgain, A. Gamburd, *Expansion and random walks in* $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$*:I,* JEMS **10** (2008) 987–1011.

[BG09] J. Bourgain, A. Gamburd, *Expansion and random walks in* $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$*:II. With an appendix by J. Bourgain*, JEMS **11**, no. 5., (2009) 1057–1103.

[BGS10] J. Bourgain, A. Gamburd, P. Sarnak, *Affine linear sieve, expanders, and sum-product,* Invent. math. **179**, no. 3., (2010) 559–644.

[BV12] J. Bourgain, P. Varjú, *Expansion in* $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})$*, q arbitrary*, Invent. math. **188**, no 1, (2012) 151–173.

[BGT11] E. Breuillard, B. Green, T. Tao, *Approximate subgroups of linear groups,* GAFA **21** (2011) 774–819.

[BO14] E. Breuillard, H. Oh (editors), Thin groups and superstrong approximation, MSRI Publ. **61**, Cambridge Univ. Press., Cambridge 2014.

[BS91] M. Burger and P. Sarnak, *Ramanujan duals II,* Invent. math. **106**, no. 1, (1991) 1–11.

[Cad] A. Cadoret, *An open adelic image theorem for abelian schemes,* to appear in IMRN.

[CT12] A. Cadoret, A. Tamagawa, *A uniform open image theorem for l-adic representations, I,* Duke Math. Journal **161** (2012) 2605–2634.

[CT13] A. Cadoret, A. Tamagawa, *A uniform open image theorem for l-adic representations, II,* Duke Math. Journal **162** (2013) 2301–2344.

[Clo03] L. Clozel, *Démonstration de la conjecture τ,* Invent. math. **151**, no. 2, (2003) 133–150.

[CU04] L. Clozel, E. Ullmo, *Equidistribution des points de Hecke,* Contributions to Automorphic Forms, Geometry and Arithmetic, (2004) volume in honor of Shalika, Johns Hopkins University Press, editors: Hida, Ramakrishnan and Shaidi, 193–254.

[CFW81] A. Connes, J. Feldman, B.Weiss, *An amenable equivalence relations is generated by a single transformation,* Ergodic Th. Dynam. Sys. **1** (1981) 431–450.

[Din06] O. Dinai, *Poly-log diameter bounds for some families of finite groups,* Proc. AMS **134**, no 11, (2006) 3137–3142.

[DDMS99] J. Dixon, M.Du Sautoy, A. Mann, D. Segal, Analytic pro-p groups, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[EHK12] J. Ellenberg, C. Hall, E. Kowalski, *Expander graphs, gonality, and variation of Galois representations,* Duke Math J. **161**, no.7, (2012) 1233–1275.

[EMO05] A. Eskin, S. Mozes, H. Oh, *On uniform exponential growth for linear groups,* Invent. Math. **160**, no. 1, (2005) 1–30.

[Fal91] G. Faltings, *Diophantine approximation on abelian varieties,* Ann. of Math. (2) **133** (1991) 549–576.

[Fer94] G. Frey, *Curves with infinitely many points of fixed degree,* Israel J. Math. **85** (1994) 79–85.

[FHJ94] M. D. Fried, D. Haran, M. Jarden, *Effective counting of the points of definable sets over finite fields,* Israel J. of Math. **85** (1994) 103–133.

[Gam02] A. Gamburd, *On the spectral gap for infinite index "congruence" subgroups of* $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$*,* Israel J. Math. **127** (2002) 157–200.

[GS04] A. Gamburd, M. Shahshahani, *Uniform diameter bounds for some families of Cayley graphs,* IMRN **71** (2004) 3813–3824.

[Gow08] W.T. Gowers, *Quasirandom Groups,* Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **17** (2008) 363–387.

[Hel05] H. Helfgott, *Growth and generation in* $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$*,* Ann. Math. **167** (2008) 601–623.

[Hel11] H. Helfgott, *Growth in* $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$*,* JEMS **13**, no. 3, (2011) 761–851.

[HLW06] S. Hoory, N. Linial, A. Widgerson, *Expander graphs and their application,* Bull. AMS **43**, no. 4, (2006) 439–561.

[Hui12] C.-Y. Hui, *Specialization of monodromy and ℓ-independence,* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I **350** (2012) 5–7.

[HL] C.-Y. Hui, M. Larsen, *Adelic openness without the Mumford-Tate conjecture,* preprint. Available online: `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1312.3812v2.pdf`

[Hum95] J. Humphreys, Linear algebraic groups, Springer-Verlag, New york, 1995.

[Ioa14-a] A. Ioana, *Orbit equivalence and Borel reducibility rigidity for profinite actions with spectral gap,* to appear in JEMS. Available online: `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1309.3026v4.pdf`

[Ioa14-b] A. Ioana, *Strong ergodicity, property (T), and orbit equivalence rigidity for translation actions,* to appear in J. Reine Angew. Math. Available online: `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1406.6628.pdf`

[Kaz67] D. Kazhdan, *On the connection of the dual space of a group with the structure of its closed subgroups,* (Russian) Funkcional. Anal. i Prilozen. **1** (1967) 71–74.

[Kes59] H. Kesten, *Symmetric random walks on groups,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **92** (1959) 336–354.

[KT07] D. Kleinbock, G. Tomanov, *Flows on S-arithmetic homogeneous spaces and applications to metric Diophantine approximation,* Comm. Math. Helv. **82** (2007) 519–581.

[LS74] V. Landazuri, G. M. Seitz, *On the minimal degrees of projective representations of the finite Chevalley groups,* Journal of Algebra **32** (1974) 418–443.

[Lub94] A. Lubotzky, Discrete Groups, Expanding Graphs and Invariant Measures, Birkhäuser, 1994.

[Lub95] A. Lubotzky, *Cayley graphs: eigenvalues, expanders and random walks,* In: Rowbinson, P. (ed.) Surveys in Combinatorics. London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **218** 155–189, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[LM13] A. Lubotzky, C. Meiri, *Sieve methods in group theory I: powers in linear groups,* JAMS **25**, no. 4, (2012) 1119–1148.

[Mar73] G. Margulis, *Explicit constructions of expanders,* Problemy Peredaci Informacii **9**, no. 4, (1973) 71–80.

[Maz00] B. Mazur, *Abelian varieties and the Mordell–Lang conjecture,* 199-227; in D. Haskell, A. Pillay, C. Steinhorn (ed.), Model theory, algebra, and geometry, MSRI Publ. **39**, Cambridge Univ. Press., Cambridge, 2000.

[Mc95] M. McQuillan, *Division points on semi-abelian varieties,* Invent. Math. **120** (1995) 143–159.

[NP11] N. Nikolov, L. Pyber, *Product decompositions of quasirandom groups and a Jordan type theorem,* JEMS **13**, no. 4, (2011) 1063–1077.

[Nor89] M. V. Nori, *On subgroups of* $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathfrak{f}_p)$*,* Invent. Math. **88**, no. 2, (1987) 257–275.

[OW80] D. Ornstein, B.Weiss, *Ergodic theory of amenable groups. I. The Rokhlin lemma.,* Bull. AMS (N.S.) **1** (1980) 161–164.

[PS] L. Pyber, E. Szabó, *Growth in finite simple groups of Lie type of bounded rank,* preprint available online: `http://arxiv.org/abs/1005.1858`

[SG05] A. Salehi Golsefidy, *Character degrees of p-groups and pro-p groups,* Journal of Algebra **286** (2005) 476–491.

[SG-a] A. Salehi Golsefidy, *Sum-Product phenomenon: the local field case,* preprint.

[SG-b] A. Salehi Golsefidy, *Super-approximation, I:* $\mathfrak{p}$*-adic semisimple case,* preprint.

[SGV12] A. Salehi Golsefidy, P. Varjú, *Expansions in perfect groups,* GAFA **22**, no. 6, (2012) 1832–1891.
[SGS13] A. Salehi Golsefidy, P. Sarnak, *Affine sieve,* JAMS **26**, no. 4, (2013) 1085–1105.
[SX91] P. Sarnak and X. Xue, *Bounds for multiplicities of automorphic representations,* Duke Math. J. **64**, no. 1, (1991) 207–227.
[Sel65] A. Selberg, *On the estimation of Fourier coe?cients of modular forms,* Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. VIII, AMS, Providence, RI, 1965, 1–15.
[Sha09] A. Shalev, *Word maps, conjugacy classes, and a noncommutative Waring-type theorem,* Ann. of Math. (2) **170**, no. 3, (2009) 1383–1416.
[Ste65] R. Steinberg, *Regular elements of semisimple algebraic groups,* Publication of IHES **25** (1965) 49–80.
[Tao08] T. Tao. *Product set estimates for non-commutative groups,* Combinatorica **28**, no. 5, (2008) 547–594.
[Var12] P. Varjú, *Expansion in* $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K/I)$*, I square-free,* JEMS **14**, no. 1, (2012) 273–305.
[Wei84] B. Weisfeiler, *Strong approximation for Zariski-dense subgroups of semisimple algebraic groups,* Ann. Math. **120** (1984) 271–315.

Mathematics Dept, University of California, San Diego, CA 92093-0112

E-mail address: golsefidy@ucsd.edu